DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 810 EA 014 881

TITLE	Validation Handbook: Information, Guidelines, and Forms for New York State Validation of Exemplary Programs.
INSTITUTION	New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	May 82
NOTE	93p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Demonstration Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Guidelines; Inspection; Program Evaluation; *Program Proposals; *Program Validation; Proposal Writing; Records (Forms); State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*New York; *Site Visits

ABSTRACT

To assist school districts, this document presents the guidelines and evaluation methods used by the New York State Education Department (SED) to identify and validate exemplary school district practices that can be adopted by other districts. The handbook integrates the three phases of the validation process, comprising the district's preparation of the application for validation, the SED's preliminary review of the application, and the visit of an SED validation team to the program site. After several introductory sections reviewing the validation process, the document provides tips and guidelines for preparing an application and discusses the application's cover sheets, the program summary, the program narrative, and the information needed by other districts to adopt the program. SED's preliminary review of the application, and the guidelines and rating scales it uses, are described in the following section. The next ten brief sections cover the validation team visit, including the district's preparations, the visit process, the team report, and appeal procedures. Five appendices present copies of forms for the validation application's cover sheets, the preliminary review's rating form, the validation team's report and evaluation of the preliminary review, and a model application, review, and validation team report. (Author/RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218810

VALIDATION HANDBOOK

Information, Guidelines, and Forms for New York State Validation of Exemplary Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Trombly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 013 881

The University of the State of New York / THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Office of Federal Demonstration Programs / Albany, New York 12234

May 1982

VALIDATION HANDBOOK

Information, Guidelines, and Forms for
New York State Validation of
Exemplary Programs

The University of the State of New York / THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Office of Federal Demonstration Programs / Albany, New York 12234

May 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University (with years when terms expire)

1988	WILLARD A. GENRICH, Chancellor, LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D., Litt.D., D.C.S., D.C.L.	Buffalo
1988	J. EDWARD MEYER, Vice Chancellor, B.A., LL.B. . . .	Chappaqua
1986	KENNETH B. CLARK, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., D.Sc.	Hastings on Hudson
1989	EMLYN I. GRIFFITH, A.B., J.D.	Rome
1983	MARY ALICE KENDALL, B.S.	Rochester
1984	JORGE L. BATISTA, B.A., J.D., LL.D.	Bronx
1986	LAURA BRADLEY CHODOS, B.A., M.A.	Vischer Ferry
1987	MARTIN C. BARELL, B.A., LA., LL.B.	Kings Point
1984	LOUISE P. MATTEONI, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Bayside
1987	R. CARLOS CARBALLADA, B.S., L.H.D.	Rochester
1988	FLOYD S. LINTON, A.B., M.A., M.P.A., D.C.L.. . . .	Miller Place
1988	SALVATORE J. SCLAFANI, B.S., M.D.	Staten Island
1989	MIMI LIEBER, B.A., M.A.	New York
1985	SHIRLEY C. BROWN, B.A., M.A., Ph.D.	Albany
1983	ROBERT M. BEST, B.S.	Binghamton

President of The University and Commissioner of Education

GORDON M. AMBACH

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education

ROBERT J. MAURER

Acting Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary, and Continuing Education

GERALD L. FREEBORNE

Assistant Commissioner for Planning and Support Services

JOHN J. MURPHY

Coordinator, Chapter 2 Local Assistance Administrative Office

SAMUEL W. CORSI, JR.

PREFACE

Program evaluation methods have received an increasing amount of attention over the past decade, and techniques are continuing to undergo improvement. The current revision represents about the tenth major revision, and the fourth revision which is in circulation. Little change in the type of information requested has been made, but major changes in organization have been undertaken. In addition, the explanation of what is desired in each section has been provided.

The current revision is the first one to integrate the description of all three phases of the validation process into a single document: preparation of the Application, Preliminary Review of the Application, and the Validation Team visit. For the most effective preparation and conduct of each phase, it is necessary to be familiar with what happens during the other two phases. It is also necessary during each phase to understand the purpose of validation: to identify exemplary practices which, hopefully, can be adopted by other school districts. The standards for identifying exemplary practices are somewhat more lenient than those which undergird most educational research. We must decide whether to recommend the adoption of a new or a replacement program to a school district, rather than to advance knowledge concerning education. Often the decision will be made pragmatically, and without data which can rule out all competing hypotheses for the data. Some of the validated programs can meet the rigorous standards of research, but many cannot.

During the past five years, 118 programs have been submitted for validation, and 56 have been awarded Certificates of Validation. Twenty of the 118 were initially rejected and subsequently reapplied, with eleven of them receiving validation. Fifteen of 71 programs visited were found to have major discrepancies between the information contained in the Application and the documentation available to the Validation Teams. These programs were not awarded validation.

The current validation process has been under continuous development for the past three years under the direction of Dr. Richard L. Egelston. It has been successful due to the invaluable efforts of several project directors, reviewers, and Validation Team members who critiqued and pilot tested several revisions of the guidelines. Special recognition should be extended to the following people for their contributions to the current guidelines:

Robert Cleary
Peter Cooke
Ted Cromack
Jim Crowley
Morgan Desmond
Donald Fabiano
Ruth Ferguson
Laura Harckham
Guy Haskins
Barrent Henry
Robert Hutchinson
Joan Keller
Paul La Fornara
Harold Leonard
Barbara Mason
Ted Obloy
Tom Palmatier
Michael Pavlovich
Vince Puleo
Jim Purcell
Richard Rowell
Reuben Rusch
Charles Stokes
Bob Wagner
Richard Wing
Gene Zola

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	iii
Introduction	1
Eligibility	2
The Validation Process	2
Guidelines for Submitting an Application	3
Tips for Preparing an Application	3
Directions	4
The Cover Page	4
Program Summary	5
Program Narrative	5
Goals	6
Context	6
Target Groups	7
Program Description	7
Objectives	8
Evidence of Effectiveness	10
Secondary Evidence, Counter Evidence, and Side Effects	13
Adoption Information	14
Planning Information	14
Comparison of Costs	14
The Preliminary Review	15
Guidelines for the Preliminary Reviewer	15
Rating Scales	16
Global Judgments	18
Preparation by a School District for a Validation Team Visit	19
The Validation Team	22
Operation of the Validation Team	22
Conflicting Reviews	23
What to Expect During the Visit	24
The Validation Team Report	24
The Verification Scales	24
The Degree of Convincing Scales	25
The Recommendation for Validation	26
Evaluation of the Preliminary Reviews	26
Appeal Procedures	26
Extending Validation	27
Turn-key Certification	27
Validation Team Training	28

Appendixes
A. Cover Page for the Application for Validation
B. Rating Form for Preliminary Review
C. Validation Team Report
D. Validation Team Evaluation of Preliminary Reviews
E. Model Application With Composite Preliminary Review and Validation Team Report

Introduction

School districts, including Boards of Cooperative Educational Services, conducting exemplary programs are invited to apply to the State Education Department for Certificates of Validation. These certificates, signed by the Commissioner of Education, are given in recognition of outstanding educational programs and practices which have survived tests of evaluation and validation. The key element in the evaluation process is demonstrating success by providing convincing evidence for independent review. Successful programs are recognized by the State Education Department as worthy of dissemination and adoption by others.

Validation is one of a series of quality control procedures employed by the New York State Education Department to identify successful educational programs, in order to promote their adoption by school districts with a need for those programs. Validation is the keystone of the Transferring Success policy developed in 1976 and pilot tested over a period of five years. The application of the Transferring Success policy provides a cost-effective method for producing educational change which has a high probability for success. A recent study found that the cost of adopting a successful program averages only 20 percent of the cost of developing a program, and that the full impact of the program can be achieved one year earlier than when a program is locally developed. Another study indicated that programs adopted under Transferring Success have a 75 percent chance of continuation after funding has been discontinued.

The need for Validated programs stems largely from a major weakness in the most common mode of educational change: the sharing of ideas and the exchange of information. That weakness is primarily associated with the human propensity for enthusiastic oversell without enough hard evidence to support glowing conclusions about a supposedly exemplary program. Many educators have expressed disappointment upon leaving a school site where an innovative project was presumably operating. Many truly promising practices were lost because potential adopters lost confidence when answers to questions of cost, facilities, staff, pupil growth, and the like were generally unanswered because poor records were kept, or when no systematic data collection design was developed or followed. It is hoped that New York State's Validation program will lessen these frustrations for all who are interested in seeking new ways to solve persistent educational problems.

The dissemination of information concerning educational practices has been a concern of Federal and State governments for a long time. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided an impetus for developing innovative ideas, but little was done to provide for transferring successful practices to other schools. Two outgrowths of the need for identifying successful projects were: (1) the Innovate, Validate, Disseminate (IVD) process by USOE, and (2) the formation of the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) by USOE and NIE. Both units employed the concept of Validation which was intended to provide a quality control mechanism for determining whether a project should be advocated by the Federal or State governments involved. The National Diffusion Network was created to provide for the dissemination of projects validated by JDRP.

The Application for Validation is a narrative evaluation report which describes a program and presents the evidence to demonstrate its success. The evidence should be

presented in summary form, but with enough detail to allow an evaluation specialist to make judgments about the degree of success described by the author. The data must be collected from a representative sample of the target group, must be statistically reliable and valid, and must convince the reader that an educationally meaningful change has occurred. The program may have been externally funded, or it may be locally funded. It may be relatively new to the district, or old to the district, but it must have potential for adoption by other schools.

The Application for Validation must also contain a description of the program along with a conceptual framework which allows content specialists to identify the major components of the project and to understand the relationships among them. The content specialist must be convinced that the program activities conform to current regulations, and that current standards of practice have been followed.

The Application for Validation should also contain information relative to the context of the project, and report how the project is managed within the school district. These elements are necessary for understanding the administrative arrangements to be followed by another district to produce a successful adoption.

Eligibility

Any public school district, campus school, state operated school, Board of Cooperative Educational Service, or consortium of schools may submit an Application for Validation directly to The State Education Department, Office of Federal Demontration Programs. Any private school or non-profit organization with an educational program may prepare an Application for Validation, but it must be submitted by the public school district in which the private school or non-profit organization is located. There is no limit on the number of programs which can be validated for an applicant district.

To date all costs of validation have been borne by the State Education Department. However, some or all of the costs incurred by the Validation Team may have to be supported by the Applicant in the future. Questions concerning the status of cost sharing should be addressed to the Coordinator of Validation at (518) 474-2380.

The Validation Process

The validation process is a highly structured and standardized process which requires the preparation of three types of evaluation reports. The first report is the Application for Validation, which provides a summative evaluation of an educational program. The Application must follow a specified format designed to provide only essential information about the project.

When the Application for Validation is received, it is acknowledged and distributed to three or more reviewers. Each reviewer is expected to have knowledge and expertise in evaluating educational programs. However, one person will have a specialized knowledge of the content of the project, another will have expertise in data collection and analysis, and the third person will have knowledge about management, dissemination, and adoption of programs.

Each reviewer prepares a diagnostic evaluation report of the Application. Two to four ratings are created for each section of the Application following a prescribed format. Each of the reviewers also makes a global rating by nominating (or failing to nominate) the project for validation. The reviews are returned to the Coordinator of Validation, who prepares the response to the Applicant. If each of the reviewers

nominates the same objective, or set of objectives, for validation, the process will continue. A complete set of reviews will be sent to the Applicant, and a site visit will be scheduled. If a program is validated, a Certificate of Validation will be awarded to the Board of Education. The Certificate will contain the name of the project and the name of the district.

If no consensus to nominate at least one objective for validation is reached, the validation process will be terminated. A complete set of reviews will be sent to the Applicant, along with the decision. The Applicant should reapply for validation as soon as responses to the reviews can be generated. Unless it is necessary to collect a new set of evaluation data, school districts are encouraged to rewrite and resubmit the Application as soon as possible.

A more detailed description of the way in which the Applications are reviewed may be found in the section called Preliminary Review.

Guidelines for Submitting an Application

The Application will consist of a narrative report which may contain tables of supporting data. The required format includes a cover page, a summary, a narrative, and some information needed to plan for program adoption. The latter three parts of the Application should be typed single spaced with 1" margins, and should contain the section headings provided in the outline which appears on pages 5 and 6.

If the Application contains one objective, it should be limited to 14 pages, plus the cover sheet, the one-page summary mentioned above and the three pages of adoption information. Up to three additional objectives may be included, and an additional two pages are allowed for each objective.

Applications may be submitted at any time during the year. The preliminary review requires three to four weeks, and the site visit (if performed) requires an additional lead time of four weeks. Submit seven copies of the Application (one signed by the Superintendent and include four copies of directions and/or maps to the project sites. Do not enclose curriculum manuals or copies of tests unless specifically requested to do so. Documentation for each section should be maintained with the applicant, since it is likely to be examined by the validation team.

All copies should be sent to:

The New York State Education Department
Coordinator of Validation
Room 860 EBA
Albany, NY 12234

It is often very helpful to request an informal review of a draft copy of the Application for Validation. If an informal review is desired, please call the Coordinator of Validation at (518) 474-2380 and request assistance. The Coordinator will also be happy to answer any questions about validation, as well as providing the informal review.

Tips for Preparing an Application

The author of the Application should prepare a document which is convincing to the reviewers. The data must clearly and convincingly demonstrate that the program

was a success. It is not the responsibility of the reviewers to provide evidence that the program does not work. Five types of problems have become evident with Applications reviewed during the past three years. They are directly attributable to the manner in which the Applications were prepared, and were unrelated to the effectiveness of the program. The five problems are presented as tips.

A. Use precise language. The Application is a technical document and is intended to be informative. It is not intended to be entertaining. Use educational jargon if the terms are appropriate, since common language is often open to a variety of meanings and anathema to the communication of technical information. The narrative sections must not contain ambiguous language.

B. Do not be redundant. If a term is described adequately in one section of the report, it is generally not necessary to describe it again. However, if it is necessary to re-explain terms, do not use different language on the two occasions. It is generally possible to define technical terms operationally by indicating what they mean to the program staff.

C. Be concise. Present the minimum amount of information necessary to get across the major points.

D. Do not editorialize. Do not present your opinions or those of colleagues about what is good or bad. The reviewers are capable of making those judgments when examining the data. Statements of belief are frequently characterized by the use of adverbs and adjectives. For example, the underlined words in the following illustrations represent beliefs (editorializing):

1. A very high reliability coefficient of .85 was found ...

2. The results were definitely caused by the project, since the control groups ...

E. Placement. Put all information required in the sections where the directions indicate it should be placed, unless the flow of information would be inhibited. If it is necessary to place information elsewhere in the document, then it should be referenced where the directions called for it to appear (e.g. see Section 3C).

Directions

A. The Cover Page - A photocopy of the cover page which appears as page A-1 in Appendix A of this document should be completed. Generally, the author of the Application should be indicated as the contact person for Validation, since the Coordinator of Validation may need to seek clarification of parts of the Application.

The superintendent should sign the document in the space indicated. By signing the Application, the superintendent indicates knowledge about the Application and approval for its submission to the Education Department.

The program content descriptors are words or phrases which might be used to classify the program in an Index. For example: reading, dropout prevention, and TMR represent convenient descriptions of program content.

The three questions at the bottom of the cover page constitute releases for particular uses of the Application. Confidentiality of the Application cannot be guaranteed since it is a public document, but the names of individuals indicated on the cover sheet will be blocked out. If any of the three items is answered "no" or "undecided," it will not prejudice the review.

B. Program Summary - Prepare a one-page summary of the program and its results. The major purposes of the summary are for orientation of the reader to what follows and for distribution to other educators. The Program Summary should be prepared after the Program Narrative is written and should contain the following information:

1.	Title of Program	(1 line)
2.	Contact Person	(1 line)
3.	Name of District	(1 line)
4.	Content Area	(1 line)
5.	Target Population	(1-3 lines)
6.	Needs Addressed	(1-3 lines)
7.	Program Description	(10-20 lines)
8.	Program Accomplishments	(1-2 lines)
9.	Estimated Costs	(1-2 lines)

C. Program Narrative - The following outline for the narrative presents the sequence of information which should be included in the Application. When preparing the Application, please include the section numbers and headings in the appropriate location, since reviewer comments will be keyed to these numbers and headings.

Outline for Narrative

1. Goals

2. Context
   a. Community Description
   b. School Description
   c. Program Rationale
   d. Program History

3. Target Groups

4. Program Description
   a. Conceptual Framework
   b. Scope
   c. Articulation
   d. Staff Activities
   e. Target Group Activities
   f. Key Definitions

5. Objective

6. Evidence
   a. Sample Selection
   b. Assessment Techniques
   c. Validity
   d. Reliability
   e. Evaluation Design
   f. Data Presentation
   g. Statistical Comparisons
   h. Educational Significance
   i. Cause and Effect
   j. Secondary Evidence, Counter Evidence, and Side Effects (Optional)

Sections 5 and 6 should be repeated for each objective

Description of Narrative

1. Goals - Describe the general intent of the project to produce long-range changes in achievements and attitudes of students, or in the way the school district is managed. The goal is not a formal statement like an objective and can be left relatively unspecific. An example of a goal statement is "to increase the problem-solving skills of junior high school students through the infusion of new teaching strategies in all major content areas." Limit this section to one paragraph.

2. Context - Describing the context of the project is important for the reader who may be completely unfamiliar with the geography, the people, and the educational programs of the district. Limit this section to two pages.

   a. Community - Briefly describe the community(ies) in which the district(s) above are located. Socioeconomic, ethnic, geographic, and political descriptions are relevant. General support for education by the community is also relevant.

   b. District - Briefly characterize the type of school district(s) involved in the project. Include factors such as enrollment, ethnic composition, types of program, and level of scholarship of students. Non-public schools within the district should be indicated as well.

   c. Program Rationale - This section of the application should describe the educational conditions or factors which led to the development of the program. The general achievement conditions, program alternatives, or management conditions should be characterized so that the reader can understand the need for the program. One way to approach this section is to report the specific needs data which led

to program development, and the priority of these needs in relation to others within the district.

d. Program History - Provide a brief chronology of events between the time the program started and the date this Application is being submitted. Sources and amounts of funding should be included. The manner in which faculty were involved in program planning and implementation is relevant. Include program expansion within and among grade levels, including any pilot testing. Also include the program director's coordination of staff training, preparation of critical content components, and the development of evaluation procedures.

3. Target Groups - A target group consists of people who are the focus of project activities and evaluation. A target group is a set of people eligible to receive the intervention, whether or not all people actually receive it. Financial considerations often mean that a program is installed only in some buildings, or some grade levels, or for certain types of staff, but cannot be spread districtwide. Describe all target groups as completely as possible. They may be students, teachers, or administrative staff. Use descriptors which pertain to grade level, content area, ability level, and test scores as they apply. The description should be complete enough so that a comparable target group could be identified in other districts.

4. Program Description - What are the salient features of the intervention? In the case of student objectives, include descriptions of new curricula, necessary inservice training, student activities, and any other relevant staff activity or program event. Two approaches to describing how students are affected by the intervention are to indicate the major program events in the year or to trace a student through a typical day. In the case of changes in institutional management, describe the services which are new or different and the activities necessary to initiate the services. Also, indicate the activities staff members perform when carrying out the services. Organize the program description around the following headings:

a. Conceptual Framework - If the program is an application of a theoretical or empirical framework found in the literature, please describe it. Otherwise describe what the content of the program and the methods for delivering it to the target group. If the program is new to the district, include the major elements which define its content (e.g. for gifted students the program might be based upon Bloom's taxonomy in several subject areas), or its processes (e.g. for screening and diagnosing students with handicapping conditions).

b. Scope - Describe the extent to which the program operates within the district. Identify the buildings, grades, and number of classrooms. Also report whether the program

supplements existing programs, replaced programs, or is a component of a larger program.

c. Articulation - Describe how this program fits into the total school program. Of particular importance is the nature of coordination and supervision. How does the project director or coordinator manage supervisory functions within and among buildings? Who reports to the project director and under what conditions? Any changes in role among professional staff should be indicated, as well as staff selection for the project. When does staff training take place, and how often is follow-up assistance provided?

d. Staff Activities - Indicate the major activities of the staff people who had main and peripheral roles as facilitators (e.g., project coordination, consultants, or teachers) in attempting to change the target group. For example, in curriculum projects, teachers' attempts to change student attitudes or cognitions and the major types of classroom activities should be mentioned. In projects which are designed to change the way the school functions, the teachers, or administrators, or even the PTA may be the primary target group, and the activities of the project staff in teaching the target group to perform necessary functions should be mentioned.

e. Target Group Activities - Indicate the major types of activities each target group engaged in during the project.

f. Key Definitions - Terms which could be misunderstood, or which can have various meanings in differing situations, should be defined. For example, "reading achievement," "gifted student," and "attendance" do not have the same meaning in all programs. The definitions presented in the Application should be those which pertain to the Applicant district.

5. Objectives - An educational program can, and should, be validated if it has either the purpose of changing students, or the purpose of changing the educational organization, or both. Students may change by learning new information, new attitudes, or new psychomotor skills. Institutions can be changed by providing new services, or providing the same services more efficiently or more effectively. All program objectives should be clearly targeted toward either changing students or changing the school district. If the objective focuses on students, the students should receive an intervention which can produce an effect in two years of time or less. An institutional objective may change students in the long run, or it may not impact upon students at all. Both types of objectives have been validated in the past few years.

An objective describes an educational intent and should indicate the target group to be changed, the nature of the change, the

time required to produce the change, how the change is to be measured, and the standards by which the change can be judged to be significant.

Each objective presented for validation must have separate evidence to support its attainment. Each objective will be reviewed and evaluated independently of all other objectives. It is possible to validate some objectives but not others from the same program; therefore, each objective must have "stand alone" capability. Sub-objectives and enabling objectives will not be validated, and should not be submitted for validation. Objectives related to developing curricular material or providing inservice training should not be submitted for validation, unless the process for developing curriculum or for delivery of inservice training is the focus of the objective (i.e., institutional objective). Curriculum development and inservice training are necessary components of most programs designed to change students and for most projects designed to change the way institutions operate. Both should be described in the section labeled "Project Description." Do not submit more than four objectives for validation.

a. Student Objectives - Student objectives should be written to include information which identifies the target group, the change expected, the cause of the change, the time period involved for the change, and the minimum criterion by which the change is to be judged successful. Separate objectives may be written either if two content areas are involved (e.g., reading comprehension and mathematics concepts), or if two types of behavior are involved (e.g., reading comprehension and reading appreciation). However, if the same objectives are used at several grade levels, separate objectives do not need to be written. It is possible to validate objectives at some grade levels but not at other grade levels.

b. Institutional Objectives - Institutional objectives should be written to indicate the services to be included, the target group directly affected by the service, the method of delivery for services, the time period which is necessary for the change, and the minimum criterion by which the change can be judged successful. The word "service" is defined broadly enough to include such things as an identification process for handicapped students, an instructional management system, and an installation of computer services.

Objectives may be presented with assessment techniques which use either norm-referenced or criterion-referenced data. Norm-referenced techniques make use of relative standards of performance by comparing the performance of one individual to a reference group. Norm-referenced procedures are appropriate when the variable forms a continuum (e.g., knowledge about algebra). The purpose of norm-referenced evaluation is to

locate the relative position of an individual in a reference group without regard to absolute standards. The obvious examples of norm-referenced objectives indicate the use of achievement tests with national norms, but other examples could indicate New York State Regents exam norms or PEP test norms. The essential feature of a norm-referenced objective is that the distribution of reference scores is known, either through the actual distribution (e.g., NCE scores), or through knowledge of the mean and standard deviation. Locally devised tests which have been administered to control groups, either concurrently or in previous years, may also be norm-referenced, since the control group data are used as reference data. Data from locally developed tests are generally less convincing than data from commercially developed tests, but local tests are often the only valid tests available.

Criterion-referenced assessment techniques make use of absolute standards of performance rather than relative standards of performance. The behavior to be observed generally forms a dichotomy such as "pass-fail," or "can do it -- cannot do it." The most common examples of criterion-referenced evaluation is for handicapped children and uses IEPs. The IEP is constructed from a diagnosis (pre-test), and a large number of discrete behaviors (performances) are set for the student to achieve by the end of the year. Instruction is individualized, and frequent observation (post-test) is used to determine if the child can perform specific tasks in the IEP. Standards are applied to the individual in two ways: to determine minimally acceptable performance on a particular task, and to determine the proportion of tasks which can be used to conclude the student has made satisfactory progress through the year. An acceptable criterion-referenced objective could indicate that X percent of the students meet Y percent of their IEP tasks in 8 months of instruction. A rationale for using criterion-referenced objectives instead of norm-referenced objectives should be provided in the Application.

Establishing reasonable standards for determining success is not an easy task. When statistical tests are used, the .05 level is a common standard, and a rationale should be provided for any value greater than .05 (e.g., p. .10). Rules-of-thumb for criterion-referenced objectives, such as the objective mentioned above, range from 80 to 90 percent. As with reliability coefficients, the lower the standard to be adopted, the less convincing the evidence will be.

EACH OBJECTIVE SHOULD IMMEDIATELY BE FOLLOWED BY THE EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS.

6. Evidence of Effectiveness - Primary evidence consists of changes identified in the objective using the tests, questionnaires, or observation schemes indicated in the objective. Each instrument (there may be more than one important test, or subtest) should be valid, reliable, and show the desired changes.

If an extensive amount of data have been collected in support of an objective, it is not necessary to present all of it in the Application. If samples of evidence are included, then an indication of other evidence available should be included.

Each objective should be evaluated with either norm-referenced or criterion-referenced procedures. Evidence should be presented in tabular form where possible. The program evaluation specialist should assist in the preparation of these sections. Each set of data should directly and clearly relate to one objective.

a. Sample Selection - If all members of the target group were served by this objective, and all were measured by the same assessment techniques, then simply state "entire target group used." On the other hand, if only a portion of the target group received the intervention, then describe how they were selected (e.g. volunteer students, volunteered classrooms, randomly selected students, etc.). If a sample of those receiving the treatment were selected for assessment, then this selection procedure should also be described.

b. Assessment Techniques - Indicate the assessment devices or techniques were used (e.g., tests, questionnaires, classroom observation, second hand reports). Name the instruments and subtests (if any) as well as the approximate dates of data collection. If national norms were used, indicate the dates of testing, the dates norms were created, and if testing was "out of level." Also indicate whether norm-referenced or criterion-referenced data were gathered by each technique or instrument.

c. Validity - What was the validity of each assessment technique and instrument used? Describe how the validity of each assessment technique and instrument was determined for the target group and the project activities (e.g., test manual, or agreement by competent professionals in and out of program)? Of particular interest is content validity, although predictive validity and construct validity may also be pertinent.

d. Reliability - What was the reliability of each assessment technique and instrument? How was it determined? Of particular interest is test-retest reliability of locally developed instruments. Interscorer reliability should be reported for structured observations and instruments of a subjective nature. If coefficients are reported in test manuals, then provide representative values.

e. Evaluation Design - Evaluation design generally refers to the timing of data collection and the groups which are compared. A group may be compared with itself (pre-post), or with another group (treatment-control). Describe the evaluation design(s) used for each objective (pre- and

post-measurement, treatment-control groups, time series, case study, Model A1, etc.).

f. Data Presentation - Summarize the results of each assessment. Present tables illustrating key comparisons using means, standard deviations, correlations, frequency distributions or whatever statistic is appropriate. The data reported here should clearly indicate if the project had a positive effect. You may not be able to report all comparisons performed due to space limitations, but you should indicate they have been done and are available for on-site inspection. Be sure to clearly label all summary data presented with group name and name of variable. Also, indicate whether some data collected do not support claims of effectiveness. A short narrative should explain the key features of each table.

g. Statistical Comparisons- If statistical tests have been performed, indicate the observed value of the statistic, the degrees of freedom, the tabled value for comparison, and the significance level. For example, an Analysis-of-Variance Table would be reported here, rather than in f above. These comparisons should be interpreted for the reader. That is, the results are basically the program accomplishments for this objective. The results of statistical tests may be reported in the data presentation tables. Any results of statistical tests should be interpreted in a narrative statement.

h. Educational Significance - Describe briefly how the program can be considered of sufficient importance for replication in New York State. (Statistically, significant results are not necessarily large enough for someone else to undertake the program). The size and gains made by the treatment group is important to discuss. The criterion employed by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel, which administers a Federal validation process, is 1/3 standard deviation for reference (pretest or control group) data as an indication of minimal educational change for potential adoption.

Independent judgments by competent specialists may also be cited which endorse the program. College-based content specialists and content specialists in other districts are acceptable sources. References to the literature are good supplements, but cannot stand alone unless they contain specific references to New York State schools.

i. Cause and Effect- Cause and effect can be established only by using appropriate experimental designs with either random selection or random assignment. In the absence of random selection or random assignment, the treatment group should be equivalent to the comparison group at the start of the treatment. Comparisons after treatment

should be significantly in favor of the treatment group to make it reasonable to conclude probable cause and effect.

The minimum design acceptable for evaluating some types of norm-referenced programs involves the use of pretreatment - post treatment gains. These programs will generally be new programs to the school rather than replacement programs. Programs which are evaluated with criterion-referenced approaches are usually evaluated using only pretreatment - post treatment designs.

Describe the degree to which the objective was met and provide evidence that the project produced the results claimed above. Discuss how alternative explanations (e.g., maturation, regression, other treatments) can be eliminated from consideration. What evidence suggests that the treatment group would not have changed as much without any intervention? (For example, the dual NCE norms which are provided with test batteries provide an expected level of change without the intervention.) If data were collected which indicate an objective was not met, this data should be reconciled with data which did show the objective was met.

j. Secondary Evidence, Counter Evidence, and Side Effects (Optional) - Evidence related to the project objective which was collected in addition to the main evidence should also be summarized and reported. It is often the case that unintended outcomes are observed, and formal data concerning them are collected as an afterthought. These data often influence reviewers and potential adoptors of the program.

Secondary evidence is supporting evidence which may have unknown validity or reliability. It may not have been collected under the same conditions as primary evidence.

Side effects of a program are unintended outcomes of programs, or are those things which occur that have lesser importance than the desired effects. If any side effects are observed, positive or negative, they should be summarized at the end of this section.

Counter-evidence consists of data which clearly does not support the objective. For example, if some grade levels show losses rather than gains, there is reason to believe the project has not produced the changes claimed in the objective. Similarly, if several target groups show non-significant gains, there may also be reason to suspect the project did not cause the results. Counter-evidence may consist of formal measurements (e.g. another test) which fail to confirm the primary evidence. Any counter evidence should be fully explained.

D. Adoption Information - This section is intended to provide SED with information necessary for installing the program in a new district. Such factors as personnel, facilities, materials, equipment, and training time are important considerations. In addition, a comparison of total developmental cost with the cost of operation is desired.

1. Planning Information - This section consists of a series of questions related to Demonstration of the program should the program become validated. Questions referring to the duration, location, and timing of the training, and questions related to the requirements for implementation of the project are necessary to adequately plan an adoption. It may be necessary to consult with appropriate administrators to determine the degree of commitment for becoming a Developer/Demonstrator. The constraints imposed upon potential adopters may be important in the decision to adopt the program. The form for "Planning Information" appears as pages A-2 and A-3 in Appendix A.

2. Comparison of Costs - One of the important factors to SED in continuing the Transferring Success policy is the cost savings resulting from the adoption of an effective project compared with the cost of developing a new solution. Therefore, estimates of the costs incurred during development are requested. In addition, the costs of operation should be estimated. It is recognized that many variables affect costs, but estimated financial data are better than no data. Please report the cost information using the format of page A-4 in Appendix A.

a. Development costs - Although the program may have been developed over a period of several years, and the narrative report may refer to project implementation one or two years ago, please attempt to estimate the total real cost of development. Provide professional and non-professional salaries including fringe benefits prorated to the amount of time spent in development. Also include stipends, consultant honoraria, travel expenses, cost of materials, and equipment. Report costs without regard to their source of funding (local, state, or Federal), or when they were incurred, as long as they should be attributed to the grant. Note that the costs in this column should be reported for the total period of development, but should not include costs incurred any years of implementation following development.

b. Operational costs - Operational costs should be reported for the most recent year of operation. In most cases these costs will be low, since staff have been trained, and the program has been fully installed. Replacement materials, regular use of consultants (e.g., a psychologist for administering individual tests), travel (e.g., field trips), and evaluation may be considered operational costs which must be anticipated in annual school budgets. If the program provides a new service which requires new personnel (not replacement of existing personnel), then salaries and fringe

benefits would be considered as operational costs. For example, developing a new mathematics program to be taught in the regular classroom would not result in additional staff. However, if the mathematics program also required the use of aides which had not previously been used, the salaries of the aides should be considered an operational cost of the program.

The Preliminary Review

Each Application for Validation is reviewed by at least three specialists within SED. One of the reviewers is the Coordinator of Validation who reads and rates all Applications. Another reviewer is a member of the Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation (Evaluation Bureau). The third (and additional) reviewers are members of Bureaus having responsibility for the program (Content Bureaus). These individuals are assigned by their respective Bureau Chiefs.

Upon receipt of the Application, the Coordinator of Validation returns an acknowledgment of receipt to the LEA and prepares memoranda for the other reviews. The date requested for returning the completed review is usually three weeks after the memo date, but occasionally reviews are not returned for four or five weeks. Each reviewer is given a copy of this manual.

The purpose for the preliminary review is to allow SED to decide whether or not to become an advocate for the program. The major criteria used in making this judgment relate to program effectiveness, perceived statewide need for the program, and ease of adoption. The preliminary review is where most evaluation judgments are made. If a program is judged worthy of validation, the district will be notified of the preliminary decision, and a site visit will be scheduled. Since the ability to communicate effectively is so very important in Transferring Success, the Application for Validation has been designed as the first level of communication. The reviewers are directed to set aside all knowledge about the project which they may have learned from visits to the district and to make judgments based soley upon the Application. The feedback provided to the LEA by each reviewer is generally useful to the author of the Application for Validation when talking or writing about the project in the future.

For a program to be validated, a consensus must be reached on any objective nominated. However, it is only necessary that one objective from a larger number be nominated for the program to become validated. The preliminary reviews of the program are intended to be unbiased only to the extent that they should not be completed by someone who helped write the Application.

Copies of all preliminary reviews are returned to the LEA whether or not the objectives are nominated for validation. Questions relative to any review should be addressed to the Coordinator of Validation. In addition, the decision of the preliminary reviewers may be appealed (appeal procedures are described in a separate section). The Application can be rewritten and resubmitted at any time, and there is no limit to the number of times a project may be resubmitted for validation.

Guidelines for the Preliminary Reviewer

Please ignore any information you already know about the program from visits to the district and from other contact with knowledgeable staff. The Application is

intended to be a document which stands alone in providing adequate descriptions and convincing evidence of program success. Therefore, please confine your judgments and comments to the information actually presented in the Application for Validation. Although the program may have been funded in whole or in part with Federal or State monies awarded by grants, any reference to grant applications would be inappropriate. The information contained in a grant application is generally outdated by at least one year, and the grant application may describe a program either larger or smaller than what is being submitted for validation. The only justifiable reference to previous documents concerning the program would depend upon whether the Evaluation Bureau had previously accepted the evaluation design and instrumentation for the objectives submitted for validation.

The actual Rating Scales appear as Appendix B to this document. They may be copied or used directly. It may be convenient to have a copy of the Directions for Preparing the Application for Validation for reference purposes. Two to four diagnostic scales are provided (described in the next section) for rating each section of the Application. Some scales should be applied to sections which describe the project as a whole, and other scales to separate objectives. Reviewers should expect that the narrative concerning separate objectives will not clearly differentiate the information concerning each objective. Consequently, re-reading sections of the document may be required.

In addition to the diagnostic ratings, three judgments which pertain to each objective are requested. The first asks for a comparison of program activities with standards of current practice, the second to indicate the strength of evidence, and the third to state the relative importance for replicating the program if validated. On the last page, two items relate to the program as a whole. The first concerns the steps the validation coordinator should take if the Application for Validation is not wholly acceptable.

The final task to be performed is to record on page B-1 of the review the number of each objective which is nominated for validation. (Please use the number which is given in the Application for Validation at the top of page B-4, or page B-4 supplement.) It is assumed that the reviewer is thoroughly familiar with the structure of the Validation Team Report, and understands that comments and conclusions by the reviewers delimit the scope of verification performed by the Validation Team. The Validation Team visit is described later in this document.

The rating form contains numerical scales and places for comments, which are intended to provide maximum feedback to the authors of the Application. Each rating form will be duplicated and sent to the project director along with an identification of the reviewer (unless otherwise requested). The project director may be advised that clarification of comments can be secured from those reviewers who provide them. You may wish to keep a copy of the Application and this review in your files for reference purposes.

Rating Scales

Please use the following operational definitions and reference values for rating each section of the Application.

Clarity - Clarity of description refers to the extent to which statements are non-contradictory, unambiguous, or which tend not to obscure the meaning of the information to be communicated. Unclear

statements may gloss-over important aspects of project operation. Indicate a 1 or a 2 rating when the unclear information is important and essential for understanding by the reader.

Value NA. Not appropriate - It is not appropriate to rate clarity on this item, since no information was presented which relates to this section.
Value 1. Very unclear - Several statements should be rewritten or eliminated (indicate which ones).
Value 2. Somewhat unclear - A few statements should be rewritten or eliminated (indicate which ones).
Value 3. Clear - Description presented may remain as presented.

Completeness - Completeness of description refers to the extent of coverage of vital information. Often a person very close to a project will assume more knowledge on the part of the reader than the reader possesses. At other times, the author will make a conscious choice not to include information due to space limitations. Indicate a 1 or a 2 rating only when the missing information is important for understanding by the reader.

Value NA. Not appropriate - The information presented in this section was not appropriate. The directions may have been misunderstood.
Value 1. Very incomplete - Several points need further explication (indicate which ones).
Value 2. Somewhat incomplete - A few points need further explication (indicate which ones).
Value 3. Complete - No points need further explication.

Appropriate - Appropriate refers to the extent to which the information presented in the section agrees with other information in the proposal. When examining the sections with rating scales labeled "Appropriate," the reviewer might rhetorically ask the following questions: Does the information in the Summary agree with the information presented elsewhere in the proposal? Is the objective appropriate to resolve one of the needs discussed in the Program Rationale section of the proposal? Has the validity been determined with an appropriate technique?

Value NA. Not Appropriate - Circle this value if any of these four reasons apply:

1. Either "Clear" or "Complete" was rated NA;
2. There is major disagreement between this section and other sections;
3. A clearly inappropriate procedure was used;
4. An unsupported interpretation or conclusion was made.

Value 1. Poor - Circle this value if either:

1. Some elements are in moderate disagreement between this section and other sections;
2. A questionable procedure was used.

Value 2. Fair - Circle this value if only:

1. A slight disagreement exists between this section and other sections, or
2. Minimally acceptable procedures, but not the best procedures were used.

Value 3. Good - The information presented measures up to all standards of appropriateness.

Convincing - Convincing refers to the degree the data persuades the reviewer that a worthwhile change has taken place. The data should show that the change met the specification of the objective with all target groups (schools, classrooms, grade levels, etc.), that the size of the change is large enough to warrant advocating the program, and that the program caused the change.

Value NA. Not Appropriate - Data have been misinterpreted, or are contradictory for some target groups. Use this rating if the evidence persuades you that the objective was not achieved, or was achieved by only a few of the target groups.

Value 1. Poor - Data presented are questionable. The data indicate the direction of change was proper for all groups, but that several target groups failed to achieve the objective.

Value 2. Fair - Data presented indicate that a satisfactory number of target groups achieved the objective.

Value 3. Good - Data indicate that all target groups achieved the objective.

Global Judgments

In addition to providing diagnostic ratings and comments, it is important to make evaluative judgments concerning the program. Most programs which are submitted for Validation have been funded through SED, requiring initial approval of objectives, evaluation design, and activities. However, programs undergo development resulting in a variety of changes which may not have been reported to SED. Whether or not changes have taken place within the program, evaluative information about the program should be collected from SED Bureaus possessing responsibility for the curricular or management area of the program. These evaluative judgments should indicate if the program meets current standards of practice, if the evidence for attaining stated objectives is convincing, if the program meets priorities for Adoption, and if the Bureau would sponsor the program for national validation assuming validation by SED. Additional questions are asked on the last two pages in order to provide information not appropriate elsewhere in the Preliminary Review.

Please keep in mind that this review has two purposes: to provide educational evaluation judgments, and to provide helpful feedback to the project director.

Preparation by a School District for a Validation Team Visit

Each Validation Team consists of three educators who have expertise related to the evaluation of school programs. The Team members have been selected from a group of more than 150 people who have undergone special training to serve on Validation Teams. Validation Team members are consultants for the New York State Education Department, and they represent the New York State Education Department during the site visit. Each Validation Team consists of a school administrator, a content specialist, and an evaluation specialist.

The purpose of the Validation Team visit is to verify the accuracy of information contained within the Application for Validation. If the Application is found to represent the program accurately and fairly, the Validation Team will recommend validation of the program. If discrepancies are revealed between what is said in the Application and what is found at the LEA, the Validation Team may take any of the following courses of action: recommend validation of the project if the discrepancies are minor, recommend validation pending revision of the Application, recommend withholding validation if the discrepancies are major.

The Validation Team members will have copies of the Application for Validation and copies of each preliminary review. The Team will not have copies of any of the proposals used in funding the projects, or of any annual reports generated by program staff. The reviews are used as guides for developing lines of inquiry and for making Team Assignments. While the preliminary reviews frequently indicate points the Team should specifically examine, the Team is not limited to these questions. Anything which has a direct bearing on the program should be checked out. Usually the Team will meet for several hours during the evening prior to the visit in order to further clarify the lines of investigation to be pursued. The Validation Team members will be in contact with each other and with the project director prior to the meeting. It is the joint responsibility of the Validation Team leader and the project director to be in contact with each other in advance of the site visit to specify the documents needed from the attached list, to allow time for the specific documents to be gathered, and to schedule observations and interviews.

When the Validation Team arrives at the school district, each member will be well prepared to pursue several lines of inquiry. The Team will be well prepared, and any general overview of the project should be kept to a minimum (15-20 minutes) unless otherwise required. Each member will typically want to talk with the project director, project staff, students, building and district administrators, and possibly Board of Education and community members. One member will pursue verification of management and financial aspects of the project, another will pursue the effectiveness aspects of the project, and the third will pursue the curriculum content aspects of the project. The visit will typically last 1½ to 2 days, and will culminate in a discussion of findings of the Team including an indication of the sections of the Application which need to be revised and any additional information the Team might need before a decision can be rendered. It is specifically requested that the project director and either the Superintendent or an Assistant Superintendent for Instruction (or equivalent) attend this discussion. (In the case of New York City projects which have been coordinated through the Board of Education, the Executive Director of the appropriate Division may represent the Chancellor.) The recommendation of the Team will probably not be announced during this meeting, but the decision to announce or not is at the discretion of the Team Leader. Approximately 20 percent of the projects visited have not been validated.

The most important thing for the Validation Team to have available is a room or work area where confidential information may be discussed and materials temporarily stored. To assist the Validation Team secure verification of the information in each section of the Application, the types of documents and arrangements which may be needed are listed below. The list may not be comprehensive for any single program, and may contain elements which are not pertinent to some programs. If actual documents or copies cannot be centrally located in advance of the visit, a list of locations where the information can be found should be prepared. The actual materials should be located and seen by the project director to facilitate the visit. The project director should ask of the Validation Team Leader, in advance, which documents to display at the time of visit.

A. Management and Financial Components (This includes expenditures from all sources).

1. Grant Award Letter, FA-10-F (final budget report), or FA-10 (budget), and all FA-10-A's (budget amendments), if external funding was secured.

2. Letters of appointment or memoranda of assignment of personnel to project payroll. Questions of confidentiality may be resolved by the use of dummy line numbers, with salary information not reported by name. If sensitivity about disclosure is high, the Team should accept the total salary aggregate as prepared by the School Business Officer, providing the procedures of aggregation are indicated upon request.

3. Copies of all vouchers including those for sub-contracts and consultants. These should be identified by category corresponding to the Cost Table in the Application. Proof of payment should be available (e.g., canceled checks, or computer printout of grant history).

4. All time sheets for hourly employees.

5. Records of attendance at in-service training sessions, including those for non-public involvement (if appropriate).

6. Documents relating to context of project: school district and community description (if available), rationale of program, and the program history.

7. Interview schedule with building and district administrators and project staff to verify how the reporting and supervisory assignments have been altered by the inception and operation of the project.

B. Effectiveness Components

1. Any baseline data from previous years (Needs data).

2. Samples of class rosters with names of project students (if

project has fewer than 500 students, provide all rosters). If confidentiality is a problem, then rosters should be coded in a manner which would allow retrieval of individual data without specifying names.

3. Test booklets, answer sheets, and answer keys (for commercial tests) for a sample of students in #1 above.

4. Copies of computer printout (if any) showing analyses of data or copies of hand computations leading to Data Summary Tables in Application.

5. Blank copies of questionnaires which students, staff, parents, or community members complete.

6. Copies of any locally developed tests, answer keys, and scoring guides. These include directions for administering tests. If local norms were used, then copies should also be available.

7. Copies of any locally developed observation schemes, and directions for their use.

8. Copies of all criteria used to select students for treatment groups. These include both procedural criteria as well as actual cut-off scores on particular instruments.

9. Copies of any other official documents relating to variables analyzed (e.g., attendance data).

10. Raw data from which reliability, and validity determinations were performed for locally developed tests, questionnaires, and observation schemes.

11. Reference tables for any statistical analyses (e.g. t tables) performed.

12. Student-prepared reports or projects resulting from assigned or independent study.

C. Content Components

1. Curriculum guides (books, activity sheets, user manuals, etc).

2. Teacher guides and training manuals.

3. Any equipment or instructional materials purchased for project.

4. Any videotapes or public information documents made for the project.

5. Documentation of use (or loan) of materials for project purposes. This is particularly important for BOCES projects involving the sharing of resources.

6. Schedules for interviewing students and staff or observing teacher-student interactions (to be arranged with Validation Team leader).

7. Schedule for interviewing Board of Education members and community members (to be arranged with Validation Team leader).

The Validation Team

A Validation Team consists of two or three educators who visit a program in order to verify the accuracy of the information contained in the Application for Validation. The Validation Team is generally limited to the function of verification, although the Team is occasionally directed to make evaluation judgments when directed by the preliminary reviewers, or the Coordinator of Validation. Often, the Team is helpful to the Applicant in creating an addendum to the Application when providing new information and when information previously presented is clarified.

Most members who serve on Validation Teams are not employees of SED, although they act on behalf of SED. Each team contains a member knowledgeable about evaluation methodology, a member who is certified in some form of school district administration, and a member who is knowledgeable about the content area of the program. All members have undergone training for these visits and are thoroughly familiar with validation techniques. Most members are either school administrators, teachers, or college faculty.

Each member of the team will be asked to serve as a Team member 2-6 weeks ahead of the site visit. Scheduling the site visit and selecting the leader of the Team is the responsibility of the Coordinator of Validation at SED. A letter of appointment, copies of the preliminary evaluations, relevant correspondence, the Application for Validation, the Validation Team Rating Scales, travel reimbursement, and tax exempt forms will be sent to each member of the Validation Team.

Operation of the Validation Team

Each Validation Team member should read the Application and preliminary reviews in advance, and prepare a list of questions, and a list of documents to be examined during the visit. Approximately one week in advance of the visit, the Team leader should contact the other Team members to form a master list of people to be interviewed and documents to be reviewed. Following this, the leader should call the project contact person to ask for a schedule of interviews and for materials to be ready.

Most Validation Teams meet together in advance of the visit (frequently the night before) and construct a plan of action in which the members divide up responsibilities for verification. Most Teams separate during the first day for individual interviews and document review. Some Validation Teams find it helpful to meet with appropriate district administrators, including the Superintendent early on the first day. Such a conference can help set the tone for subsequent activities of the Team and may also serve to familiarize the administrators with validation and prepare them for the type of report given at the exit interview. The Team may wish to assemble for lunch to discuss information collected and to clarify further courses of action. The evaluation specialist on the Team should feel free to selectively check statistical computations.

Again most Teams will assemble in the late afternoon and evening of the first day to do a first draft of the Validation Team Report. The second day will generally be occupied with filling in gaps and in conducting the exit interview. It is not unusual to have the visit completed by early afternoon of the second day. The visit should terminate with an exit interview at which the strengths and weaknesses of the project are discussed with the project director, the Chief School Administrator (or designated person), and whoever else attends. The discussion should be led by the Team leader. The decision concerning Validation of the program may or may not be communicated to those present at the exist interview (at the discretion of the Team leader). A copy of the Team Report will be sent to the project coordinator.

Occasionally, the wrong documentation is given to the Team, and correct documentation cannot be readily prepared by the Applicant. When this occurs, the Team leader may exercise the option to prematurely terminate the visit. Alternatively, the visit may continue up to the point of making a recommendation. If the documentation can easily be sent via the mail, the Team may accept the documentation, and subsequently, make a recommendation. If the Team is unable to complete the visit, the Coordinator should be notified for appropriate follow-up action.

Within a few days after the site visit is completed, the Team leader should call the Validation Coordinator at SED to announce the recommendation. One signed copy of the Team Report should be submitted to the Validation Coordinator as soon as all addenda can be prepared. The leader should retain a copy of all materials since questions concerning procedures or judgments may need to be answered.

All allowable expenses, up to prescribed limits, will be reimbursed for each team member. In addition, an honorarium may be paid for each site visit day with an additional honorarium to the Team leader. Receipts for most expenses (e.g., parking, tolls, telephone calls, etc.) are required.

Conflicting Reviews

While a program may be nominated for a site visit, the reviewers may be in disagreement concerning ratings and diagnostic comment on some sections. In these situations, the Validation Team may have a question about how to proceed. The following general guidelines should be followed. When one reviewer requests additional information, and the others do not, the additional information should be supplied. This situation arises frequently, and most applicants have already prepared an addendum. If no addendum is prepared, the Validation Team should guide the development of an addendum. If two reviewers indicate differing information is needed for a section, then the addendum should be constructed to contain all requested information.

In the case where one or two reviewers have rated a section low, but have failed to provide a comment indicating what additional information is needed, the Validation Team should ignore the low ratings, and proceed as if the ratings had been high. In the few cases where the reviewers disagree among themselves, and subsequently request contradictory or incompatible statements, the Validation Team should exercise its best judgment, and assist the Applicant prepare a response to one of the reviewers. The Team should indicate their advice to the Applicant in the Validation Team Report. If the Validation Team has a serious disagreement with the preliminary reviews, then the Coordinator of Validation should be notified.

If any questions of procedure or interpretation arise during the visit, the Coordinator of Validation should be called.

What to Expect During the Visit

The Applicant has been asked to provide documentation of all evidence and claims made within the Application to the Validation Team. These include directions and guides for operating procedures, copies of all materials developed or used in the project, purchase requisitions, student schedules, student test papers or other records, computer print-out of raw data and analyses, inservice training schedules and content, as well as information relating to the description of the district(s) and community(ies). Whatever documentation is available should be open to inspection by the Validation Team. Any professional educators, students, or lay people who may have had any contact with the project should be considered as potential sources of information about the project.

Many people at the school district will be unprepared for the Validation Team visit in spite of requests to the project director to brief everyone involved. Generally, staff will be very helpful, although somewhat irritated on occasion by the depth of questioning. It may be necessary to explain validation and the role of the site visit a number of times.

The Validation Team Report

The Validation Team Report is a report which is submitted to SED upon completion of the Validation Team visit. It consists of a cover sheet, a set of scales for indicating verification procedures used, a set of scales for reporting the degree to which the verification was convincing, a recommendation concerning validation, and an indication of who was present during the exit interview. The form for the Validation Team Report appears as Appendix C.

The Verification Scales - For each section or subsection included in the Application for Validation an indication of the verification procedures used, and the degree to which the verification evidence is convincing, should be made. Use the following operational definitions and scale values. The Validation Team Report forms are provided in Appendix C.

Verification generally refers to the determination from independent sources (independent from the authors of the Application) that the statements are accurate. Basically, the verification procedure is similar to an accreditation process. The categories below summarize the procedures used by the Team. Several procedures should be used to verify most sections or subsections of the Application.

A. Direct inspection of primary documents (e.g., vouchers, curriculum guides, student test papers).

B. Direct inspection of secondary documents (e.g., financial reports, computer printouts of test scores, formative evaluation documents).

C. Interview with those people who produce the intervention directly (e.g., teachers).

D. Interview with members of the treatment group (e.g., students).

E. Direct observation of intervention being implemented.

F. Interview with observers who were not direct recipients of the treatment (e.g., parents, non-involved teachers).

G. Interview with people unconnected with project.

H. Other

I. Unable to secure any verification.

NA. Not Applicable.

Occasionally differing sources of information will provide confusing or even contradictory evidence of claims and activities. If this situation arises, then the collective judgment of the team should be brought to bear on the item. If the judgment is different than that of the preliminary review, then counter evidence should be submitted as an addendum to this report. The degree to which verification supports the statements made and/or is convincing to the Validation Team is what is described below. Multiple sources are generally superior to single sources, and primary sources are generally superior to secondary sources. However, occasions may arise where only weak support for statements can be found.

The Degree of Convincing Scales - The categories below describe the rating scale for determining how convincing the information derived from the verification process is. The rating scale is judgmental, and should represent the "average" response of the Validation Team. Judgments should be referenced to whether or not the rater could recommend that school district professionals from other districts accept the statements made in the Application based upon the verification procedures used.

Value 5 - Documentation quantity and quality is very convincing. No reservations about accuracy of any statement with section or subsection.

Value 4 - Documentation quantity or quality is moderately convincing. Minor reservations about accuracy of statements, but reservations are not strong enough to prevent recommendation.

Value 3 - Documentation quantity and quality is only mildly convincing. Major reservations concerning accuracy of statements. Recommendation may be marginally supported at best. Most 3s will result in not recommending for validation.

Value 2 - Documentation quantity and quality is not convincing at all. Definitely cannot recommend.

Value 1 - Documentation exists that statements made are in error, and that other procedures, activities, or findings better represent the project.

If the project director indicates a willingness to rewrite the sections which are in error, and/or which need clarification, the ratings by the Validation Team should be revised to reflect the new statements. Revisions should be submitted with this Validation Team Report.

Occasionally the Validation Team will discover evidence which was not reported, and which indicates the objectives were not achieved. The Team leader should contact the Coordinator of Validation about the details of this evidence. Subsequent reanalysis and/or reporting of this new information may be requested from the Applicant. If the Team leader recommends an amended Application to the Coordinator of Validation, it should be done via a separate letter, with reasons cited. In this instance the Team should not submit a recommendation to reject the Application for Validation.

The Recommendation for Validation - A single global recommendation should be made concerning each objective examined. If all ratings are 4s and 5s, then no problem exists; the project should be validated. If 3s are given, the decision to validate will probably depend on which section is rated poorly. If 1s and 2s are awarded for any section, the project should not be validated until changes are made within the section.

The Validation Team should attempt to identify strengths and weaknesses of project design and implementation. Comments will be useful to the project director and SED. An evaluation of the preliminary review would be appreciated. The form is attached, and will not be returned to the Applicant.

The collective judgment of the Team will determine the basis for forwarding to the Commissioner the recommendation to award a Certificate of Validation. A unanimous recommendation by a Validation Team will be a good guide. However, if the Validation Team cannot arrive at a common recommendation, the Commissioner will weigh the respective reports. The global recommendation of the Team, and any dissent should be recorded on the cover sheet of this Team Report.

Evaluation of the Preliminary Reviews - Validation Team members should assume that each section of the Application is acceptable unless otherwise indicated on the preliminary review forms. If any Validation Team member has disagreements with the preliminary reviews, then comments should be supplied on the forms provided (see Appendix D) and submitted as a part of the Validation Team Report. This commentary is needed as a part of the checks and balances process of validation. In no case, however, should a Validation Team member express the idea to school district people during the site visit, that the preliminary evaluation was "unacceptable" and the project will not be validated because SED did not do a proper job. Judgments to withhold validation should be made only if the claims made in the Application for Validation cannot be substantiated, or if unreported data are discovered which cast doubt on the effectiveness of the project. The word "claim" is used broadly enough to encompass needs, activities, evaluation design, evidence, etc.

Appeal Procedures

If the applicant believes that the Preliminary Review has resulted in an unfair

decision, the applicant may appeal the decision. The first step should be to call the Coordinator of Validation at (518) 474-2380 and informally discuss the disagreement. If the applicant is still convinced that an unfair decision has been made, a letter should be written to the Coordinator, Office of Federal Demonstration Programs. The letter should present the arguments of the applicant, and should request a new Preliminary Review.

If the program is not validated following a Validation Team visit, and the applicant believes the Validation Team has misinterpreted information, ignored information, or included information which is not relevant, a written rebuttal to the Validation Team Report should be sent to the Coordinator of Validation. The rebuttal will be sent to each Validation Team member for additional interpretation. The Validation Team will then provide a written response which will be transmitted to the applicant. If the applicant still believes an unjust decision has been made, a letter should be sent to the Coordinator, Office of Federal Demonstration Programs, presenting the arguments of the applicant. The Coordinator will determine a course of action.

If the applicant believes the Validation Team has not recommended the project for validation for reasons unrelated to the interpretation of evidence (e.g., personality disagreements, bias, or for other reasons of impropriety), the applicant should contact the Coordinator of Validation and explain the problem. The Coordinator of Validation will arbitrate the situation.

Extending Validation

Some programs undergo continuing development following validation. This development may expand the original program to new target groups (e.g., new grade levels or to handicapped students) or to new objectives with the same group. It is possible to apply for validation for essentially the same project being extended to new target groups, and for new objectives with the same group. To do so, a new Application is required, and a Preliminary Review will be performed. A Validation Team visit may, or may not, be conducted at the discretion of the Coordinator of Validation. While SED will recognize the new claims for program effectiveness, it will not issue a new Certificate of Validation.

Turn-Key Certification

One of the alternatives to validation is Turn-Key Certification. If a school district wishes to become recognized as a potential demonstration district for a program validated in another district, it is possible to apply for Turn-Key Certification, which is simpler and less costly than validation. Inasmuch as the program has already been validated, it is necessary only to determine which claims (objectives) have been successfully replicated with target groups at the Turn-Key site. Currently, any LEA which has successfully adopted a Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) or New York State validated project is eligible to become a Turn-Key Demonstrator. Thus, the LEA must be operating all components of the program which will be demonstrated, but not necessarily all components of the program originally validated.

Turn-key Certification can be conferred upon any public school district which has successfully adopted an NDN or ESEA Title IV-C validated program. The Application for Turn-Key Certification is similar to the Application for Validation in that there must be evidence of program impact at the Turn-Key site (e.g., evidence of significant student change), but is different from the Application for Validation in that

it does not require evidence of reliability, validity, or cause and effect to be established at the Turn-Key site.

While the Application for Turn-Key Status will be reviewed and evaluated within the Department, a site visit will not be necessary. However, it will be necessary for the Department to secure from the Developer/Demonstrator a statement indicating that the project has been faithfully adopted, and that the project staff have undergone the required training to be certified as competent by the Developer/Demonstrator. Turn-Key Status for New York State implies that the site may be visited by interested parties to see the project in operation. It also implies that the staff are willing and able to help other school districts adopt the project.

Districts which have successfully adopted a validated project are urged to apply for Turn-Key Certification. A statewide series of Turn-Key districts can facilitate the spread of good programs, since new districts may be willing to support travel for short distances, but not for long distances, to become aware of new ideas, and to secure the necessary training.

Guidelines and Application Forms may be secured form the Coordinator of Validation, Room 860 EBA, New York State Education Department, Albany, NY 12234.

Validation Team Training

Periodically, training workshops are held for people who are interested in becoming members of Validation Teams. The workshop duration is about five hours plus a break for lunch. Training consists of a discussion of the concepts of validation, a brief history of validation, a detailed examination of the validation proccess, and a simulation of a Validation Team visit. The training is concluded with a discussion of the common problems encountered by Validation Teams and some experiences of Validation Team participants.

Those people interested in receiving training should write to the Coordinator of Validation expressing this interest and requesting further information. There is no guarantee that all people trained will be used on Validation Teams, since the demand is controlled by the number of Applications received, and the content of the programs to be validated. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that funds will be available for honoraria, although travel costs will be reimbursed. The address of the Coordinator of Validation appears at the end of the previous section.

Appendix A

Cover Page for the Application
for Validation

Revised May 1982 File Number _____

Application for Validation

Project Title: _____

_____

_____

Applicant Agency and Address: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____
Zip Code

Name of Chief Administrator: _____

Signature of Chief Adminnistrator: _____

Telephone Number: ( ) _____

Date of Application: _____

Name and Address of Contact Person for Project During Validation Team Visit _____

_____

_____

_____ _____
Zip Code

Telephone Number: ( ) _____

Program Content Descriptor(s) _____

The number of objectives submitted for validation is _____.

May this Application be copies and used for instructional purposes? Yes No Undecided

May this Application be copies and used for research purposes? Yes No Undecided

May this Application, with all reviews, be published in monograph or book form providing the name and location of the district are disguised? Yes No Undecided

PLANNING INFORMATION

The following items will be of interest to school administrators and Boards of Education considering adoption of your program. The information is useful for planning purposes, but additional information may also be useful. Please feel free to add any information which would assist in planning for adoption of the program.

1. Will personnel be available to conduct an awareness presentation outside the district if expenses are paid by the district receiving the awareness? _____ In how many cases? _____

2. Is the program available for visitation by teachers and administrators from other school districts? _____

3. Will personnel be available to conduct training if their expenses and consultant fees are paid by the district receiving training? _____ For how many days will personnel be available? _____

4. How many days of initial training are required? _____ (If more than one trainer is needed, indicate how many. _____)

5. How many days of follow-up training are required? _____

6. Is "on-site" monitoring of program implementation desirable? _____ If yes, how many days? _____

7. What is the recommended number of participants for a training group? _____

8. How many school districts (separate adoptions) could be given training (not necessarily at the same time) and technical assistance each year? _____

9. Is it necessary for training to take place in the Developer/Demonstration district? _____

10. What activities take place during training (e.g., making lesson plans, simulated teaching, curriculum writing, etc.)?

_____

_____

_____

11. List the materials to be used during training which must be purchased from the Demonstration district (e.g., curriculum guides, tests).

_____

_____

_____

12. List the materials which must be purchased or rented from a commercial source for program implementation (e.g., films, textbooks, achievement tests).

_____

_____

13. List the items of equipment which must be used for program implementation (if any).

_____

_____

14. Indicate any special facilities necessary for program implementation (e.g., one-way windows).

_____

_____

15. Provide a reasonable timeline for implementation, starting with training and ending with the evaluation which can demonstrate program success. This timeline might vary from 3 months to 24 months.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. Additional information: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

COST COMPARISON

Item	Development	Operation
1. Personnel Salaries, Wages, Honoraria, and Fringe Benefits		
a. Professional salaries		
b. Non-professional salaries		
c. Fringe benefits		
d. Consultant honoraria		
e. Stipends		
2. Instructional Materials		
a. Books/Journals		
b. Films/Tapes		
c. Tests and scoring services		
3. Instructional Equipment		
a. Purchased		
b. Rental/Lease		
4. Travel		
a. Student		
b. Staff		
c. Consultant		
5. Support		
a. Printing/Copying		
b. Postage/Telephone		
6. Other		

Appendix B

Rating Form for Preliminary Review

Revised May 1982

File # _____
Reviewer # _____

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Project Title: _____

_____

School District: _____

_____

The number of objectives to be reviewed is: _____

SED Unit conducting review: _____

A copy of this review will be submitted to the Applicant. Please make any comments understandable to the author of the Application. In anticipation of questions of clarification, it would be advisable to retain a copy of both the Application and this review. If you do not wish your name to appear on the copy which is returned to the Applicant, check here: _____. Please return the original to:

Dr. Richard L. Egelston
Coordinator of Validation
Room 860 EBA
New York State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234

Please complete the following:

1. Which objectives (if any) are nominated for validation? _____
2. For which target groups (if not all) does the nomination for Validation apply (e.g., grade levels)? _____
3. Date of review: _____
4. Signature of reviewer (optional): _____
5. Comment to LEA: _____

_____

_____

Diagnostic Evaluation

Please circle the number corresponding to your judgment. Indicate on the comment line the nature of the changes to be made in the Application when any rating of 1 or 2 is given. Use additional sheets if necessary. The first two pages and the last page provide ratings which pertain to the project as a whole. Each of the other categories in this form pertains to a single objective. Each objective nominated for validation should stand alone and not be dependent upon other objectives. Each objective is to be rated or discussed on items spread over two pages. If two or more objectives have been submitted, supplementary pages have been attached to this document. In reviewing the Application, you may treat each objective separately, or you may treat them collectively. If the latter technique is used, please write-in the numbers of the objectives so treated in the space provided at the right of the page. Refer to pages 15-18 of this document for a description of the rating scales.

Sections and Ratings					Comments
SUMMARY					
Clear	NA	1	2	3	
Complete	NA	1	2	3	
Accurate	NA	1	2	3	
PROPOSAL NARRATIVE					
1. GOALS (not to be rated)					
2. CONTEXT					
a. Community description					
clear	NA	1	2	3	
complete	NA	1	2	3	
b. School description					
clear	NA	1	2	3	
complete	NA	1	2	3	
c. Program rationale					
clear	NA	1	2	3	
complete	NA	1	2	3	
d. Program history					
clear	NA	1	2	3	
complete	NA	1	2	3	

Reviewer # _____ File # _____

3. TARGET GROUP

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3

4. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

a. Conceptual framework

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

b. Scope

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3

c. Articulation

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3

d. Staff activities

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3

e. Target group activities

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3

f. Key definitions

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3

COMMENTS

Reviewer # _____

File # _____

5. OBJECTIVE(s) _____

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

6. EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS

a. Sample selection

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

b. Assessment techniques

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

c. Validity of assessments

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

d. Reliability of assessments

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

e. Evaluation design

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

f. Data presentation

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

COMMENTS

Reviewer # _____ Objective # _____ File # _____

g. Statistical comparisons

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

h. Educational significance

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

i. Cause and effect

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

j. Secondary evidence etc.

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

7. ADOPTION INFORMATION

a. Planning Information

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3

b. Cost Comparisons

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3

COMMENTS

Reviewer # _____ Objective # _____ File # _____

JUDGEMENTS BY REVIEWER

a. Is evidence sufficiently convincing for the objective to be nominated for validation? (Circle one) Yes No

b. Is the objective important enough to be replicated in other districts if validated? (Circle one) Yes No

c. Would you support this objective for National Validation based on the evidence provided? (Circle one) Yes No

d. Is the program in compliance with current Federal and state regulations? (Circle one) Yes No

5. OBJECTIVE(s) _____

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

6. EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS

a. Sample selection

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

b. Assessment techniques

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

c. Validity of assessments

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

d. Reliability of assessments

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

e. Evaluation design

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

f. Data presentation

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

COMMENTS

Reviewer # _____ Objective # _____ File # _____

g. Statistical comparisons

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

h. Educational significance

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

i. Cause and effect

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
convincing	NA	1	2	3

j. Secondary evidence etc.

clear	NA	1	2	3
complete	NA	1	2	3
appropriate	NA	1	2	3

B-5 Supplement

7. ADOPTION INFORMATION

Make these ratings on page B-5.

COMMENTS

Reviewer # _____ Objective # _____ File # _____

JUDGEMENTS BY REVIEWER

a. Is evidence sufficiently convincing for the objective to be nominated for validation? (Circle one) Yes No

b. Is the objective important enough to be replicated in other districts if validated? (Circle one) Yes No

c. Would you support this objective for National Validation based on the evidence provided? (Circle one) Yes No

d. Is the program in compliance with current Federal and state regulations? (Circle one) Yes No

Appendix C

Validation Team Report

Revised May 1982 File # _____

VALIDATION TEAM REPORT

for

Project Title _____

_____

School District _____

_____

Signature of Chairperson _____

Address: _____

_____

Telephone No. (_____) _____

Other Members _____
Of Team
(Print Names) _____

_____

Dates of Visit _____

Within the attached Application for Validation _____ objectives were nominated for validation by the preliminary reviewers.

How many objectives (if any) are recommended for validation by the Validation Team? _____. If some are recommended, but not all, which ones are recommended (identify by number)? _____.

Were the recommendations for Validation by the Team unanimous? _____. If not, a minority report should be included.

Which sections, if any, of the Application for Validation have been rewritten as a result of the site visit? _____.

Please return one copy of this review form to Coordinator of Validation, Room 860 EBA, New York State Education Department, Albany, New York 12234. Copies of this report will be sent to the project director or coordinator, and to appropriate Bureaus within the New York State Education Department. Each Team member will also be sent a copy.

Summary Rating for the Validation Team

Please circle the letters and numbers which correspond to the collective judgment of the Validation Team for each section and subsection. When ratings of 1 are given, submit an addendum explaining evidence. Please note that if more than one objective is being examined, separate rating forms for each objective may be attached. Any explanations should be attached on separate pages. The descriptions of the Ratings for the codes may be found on pp. 24-26 of this manual.

Section	Verification Procedures	Degree of Convincing
Summary	**********	**********
1. Goals	**********	**********
2. Context	**********	**********
a. Community Description	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
b. District Description	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
c. Program Rationale	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
d. Program History	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
3. Target Group	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. Project Description	**********	**********
a. Conceptual Framework	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
b. Scope	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
c. Articulation	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
d. Staff Activities	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
e. Target Group Activities	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
f. Key Definitions	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. Objective(s) #_____	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. Evidence	**********	**********
a. Sample Selection	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
b. Assessment Techniques	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
c. Validity	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
d. Reliability	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
e. Evaluation Design	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
f. Data Presentation	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
g. Statistical Comparisons	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
h. Educational Significance	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
i. Cause and Effect	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
j. Secondary Evidence	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
7. Adoption Information	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA

Does the Validation Team Recommend the objective(s) rated above for Validation (circle one)? Yes No

File # _____

Summary Rating for the Validation Team

Section	Verification Procedures	Degree of Convincing
Summary	**********	**********
3. Target Group	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. Project Description	**********	**********
a. Conceptual Framework	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
b. Scope	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
c. Articulation	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
d. Staff Activities	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
e. Target Group Activities	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
f. Key Definitions	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
5. Objective(s) #_____	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
6. Evidence	**********	**********
a. Sample Selection	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
b. Assessment Techniques	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
c. Validity	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
d. Reliability	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
e. Evaluation Design	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
f. Data Presentation	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
g. Statistical Comparisons	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
h. Educational Significance	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
i. Cause and Effect	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA
j. Secondary Evidence	A B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 5 NA

Does the Validation Team Recommend the objective(s) rated above for Validation (circle one)? Yes No

C-2 Supplement

File # _____

File # _____

1. Please list the names of all members present at the exit interview, including Validation Team members.

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

   d. _____

   e. _____

   f. _____

   g. _____

   h. _____

   i. _____

   j. _____

2. Was recommendation concerning validation announced during exit interview?

   Yes No

3. Accurate descriptions are needed for dissemination. Answer this question only if the project is being recommended for validation. Which sections of the Application for Validation, if any, were rewritten and forwarded by the Validation Team Chairperson? (Please identify by section number and letter)?

   _____

4. Please summarize the observations, thoughts, and recommendations of the Validation Team concerning the project as a whole. These may range from observations concerning the enthusiasm of staff to direct recommendations for a change in activities. They may also include recommendations concerning preparation of information for dissemination. While the thoughts of the Validation Team are valued by SED, they are not binding on either SED or the applicant district.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

Appendix D

Validation Team Evaluation
of Preliminary Reviews

Validation Team Evaluation of Preliminary Reviews

The Validation Team is requested to evaluate the nomination of the program for Validation. Item 1-11 should reflect the Team judgment concerning the decision to nominate the project for a visit. Please check any item which should have led to the Application for Validation being rejected. The remaining items concern the individual preliminary reviews, and may require a narrative response.

_____ 1. Program activities do not meet current standards of practice.
_____ 2. Data were either unrelated or marginally related to the objective, and failed to relate to the measurable variables indicated by the objective.
_____ 3. Data collection techniques were not adequately assessed for appropriate reliability coefficient.
_____ 4. Data collection techniques were not as reliable as they should have been.
_____ 5. Data collection techniques were not adequately assessed for appropriate validity.
_____ 6. Data collection techniques were not as valid as they should have been.
_____ 7. The experimental design was improper for determining whether the objective was met.
_____ 8. The analytical techniques were not matched to the experimental design.
_____ 9. The analytical techniques were improperly applied.
_____ 10. The standards accepted for demonstrating success (e.g., p .05) were too low.
_____ 11. Stated or implied conclusions were not supported by the data.

12. Were the diagnostic comments (if any) in the reviews helpful to the author of the Application? (Circle appropriate option).

Reviewer #1	Yes	No	None Given
Reviewer #2	Yes	No	None Given
Reviewer #3	Yes	No	None Given
Reviewer #4	Yes	No	None Given

13. Were the diagnostic comments (if any) helpful to the Validation Team? (Circle appropriate option).

Reviewer #1	Yes	No	None Given
Reviewer #2	Yes	No	None Given
Reviewer #3	Yes	No	None Given
Reviewer #4	Yes	No	None Given

14. Were the diagnostic comments (if any) consistent with the overall judgment to visit the program? (Circle appropriate option).

Reviewer #1	Yes	No	None Given
Reviewer #2	Yes	No	None Given
Reviewer #3	Yes	No	None Given
Reviewer #4	Yes	No	None Given

15. Did any of the reviewers appear to "miss the boat," and prepare a review that was "way off base?" (Indicate who).

Appendix E

Model Application With Composite Preliminary Review and Validation Team Report

Revised January, 1982

RECEIVED
APR 1 2 1982
Office of Federal Demonstration Programs

File Number V-51

Application for Validation

Project Title: The Classroom Program of the Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children

Applicant Agency: Putnam/Northern Westchester Board of Cooperative Educational Services

Address: Pines Bridge Road
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598
Zip Code

Name of Chief Administrator: Dr. John Battles

Signature of Chief Administrator:

Telephone Number: (914) 245-2700

Date of Application: March 31, 1982

Name and Address of Contact Person for Project During Validation Team Visit: Amy Toole, Supervisor
Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children
French Hill School; Baldwin Road
Yorktown Heights, N.Y. 10598
Zip Code

Telephone Number: (914) 962-2377

Program Content Descriptor(s): Special Education and Early Childhood Education

The number of objectives submitted for validation is 1 objective with 4 parts.

May this Application be copied and used for instructional purposes? Yes No Undecided

May this Application be copied and used for research purposes? Yes No Undecided

May this Application, with all reviews, be published in monograph or book form providing the name and location of the district are disguised? Yes No Undecided

Program Summary

TITLE OF PROGRAM: The Classroom Program of the Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children

CONTACT PERSON: Amy Toole, Supervisor

NAME OF DISTRICT: Putnam/Northern Westchester Board of Cooperative Educational Services

CONTENT AREA: Special Education and Early Childhood Education

The BOCES Classroom Program provides early intervention services for children 2½ to 5 years of age who exhibit one or more of the handicapping conditions defined for children in New York State. Classifications of handicapped children are determined according to the current Commissioner's Regulations for school-age children. The Classroom Program primarily serves preschool children with mild or moderate impairments. This Program was conceived in light of the growing evidence that early intervention services improve the intellectual capacity of preschool children and result in a reduced need for special education services in later school years. Thus, the overall intent of the Classroom Program is to improve children's academic and social functioning so they may be placed in the least restrictive environment upon reaching school age.

The Classroom Program is characterized by two salient features -- its team involvement model and the interactive teaching process employed by classroom staff. Individual program elements are combined in a unique manner, forming an interrelated, comprehensive approach to both diagnostic-prescriptive services and classroom instruction.

Within each Program classroom, both a morning and afternoon session are offered with approximately ten children in each session. Children spend 2½ hours per day, five days per week, over a ten-month period in classrooms staffed by a full-time teacher-teacher aide team with support from parent volunteers. The speech and language pathologist, psychologist and social worker who also work within this setting are available on a part-time basis. The structured, routine schedule followed in Program classrooms is carefully planned and allows for large and small group activities, as well as individual time. Through this structured routine, the Classroom Program provides a series of intensive learning experiences for participating students.

Evaluative data collected from the BOCES Classroom Program demonstrates that, in comparisons with national norms, students in this Program made statistically and educationally significant gains from pre- to posttest in four skill areas measured by the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities. The skill areas measured were: Verbal, Perceptual-Performance, Motor, and General Cognitive.

The per student costs for the program installation with a class of 20 students are approximately $3,102.75 for the initial year of operation and $2,843.00 for subsequent years.

Program Narrative

GOALS

The Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children is a cross-categorical,[1] early intervention program for preschool children with special needs. The Program consists of three components -- An Identification and Screening System, a Home Program for children birth to three, and a Classroom Program for children 2½ to 5. It is this latter component -- the Classroom Program -- that is being submitted for New York State Validation. The overall intent of the Classroom Program is to improve children's academic and social functioning so they may be placed in the least restrictive environment upon reaching school age. To this end, the Classroom Program has five major goals:

1. To identify and serve handicapped children, 2½ to 5, from the eighteen member school districts in the BOCES region;

2. To develop individualized educational plans jointly with parents that indicate the goals and objectives appropriate for each child's special needs;

3. To effect significant improvement in each child's a) language; b) perceptual; c) motor; d) social-emotional; and e) general cognitive skills;

4. To help parents of handicapped children understand their child's special needs and, where appropriate, carry on remediation activities in their home; and,

5. To make specific recommendations to local school district personnel about participating children so that appropriate educational planning can take place for each child.

CONTEXT

Community

The Classroom Program serves eligible children from Northern Westchester and Putnam Counties of New York. This region encompasses rural farmland, suburban communities, and several cities of 20,000 to 35,000 people. The population is predominantly English-speaking, although there is a growing influx of Spanish, Italian, and other bilingual ethnic groups. The socioeconomic status of the area is quite varied, with the major cities of Peekskill and Ossining having considerably lower levels of employment, income and education than the other communities in the region. Generally, the residents of this area are supportive of education at the local school district level and often participate in activities offered through community colleges or BOCES adult education programs.

---

[1] Services are available to children with all types of handicapping conditions defined by New York State.

District

The Classroom Program is sponsored by the Putnam/Northern Westchester Board of Cooperative Educational Services. The BOCES serves eighteen local school districts in the two-county area, providing programs that individual school districts could not offer as effectively or economically. In the area of special education, the BOCES provides districts with programs for children birth to 21 with a wide range of handicapping conditions. BOCES services for the 5-21 age group are offered in a variety of educational settings, including special education classrooms, and special schools. In accordance with state and federal laws, all BOCES special education programs for this age group serve students who are referred by their local school districts through the Committee on the Handicapped.

In the area of early childhood, special education, the Putnam/Northern Westchester BOCES provides services to children birth to five through its Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children. All public school, special education services for this population are provided through the BOCES under agreement with the Chief School Officers of the BOCES component school districts. It is the belief of these administrators that a regional preschool program with a larger student population would be more cost-effective than individual district programs for a small number of handicapped children.

Program Rationale

The need for a preschool, special education program that would serve children with a variety of handicapping conditions was first identified by the BOCES Special Education Department and the Putnam/Northern Westchester Chief School Officers in 1975. Until that time, special education programs had focused largely upon the school-age child who was unable to function in the regular classroom. Some preschool services were provided for a few severely mentally retarded and orthopedically impaired children through private agencies in the region. However, services were limited to the severely impaired population and no educational screening program was available in the two-county area. With the passage of P.L. 94-142 and the increased awareness among educators of the benefits of early intervention, the BOCES component districts agreed that preschool education would be valuable for all young children with handicapping conditions. Thus, the Classroom Program was started in an attempt to bridge the gap between the already existing resources in the schools and communities and the needed services for preschoolers, age 2½ to 5.

Program History

The Classroom Program of the BOCES Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children opened its doors to children with special needs in January, 1976 with one classroom serving approximately 15 students. Using Title VI-B monies administered through the New York State Education Department[2], the Program also received a three-year demonstration grant from the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program, U.S. Department of Education. Funding from this grant ranged from $69,000 in the first year to $120,000 in the third year. To offset the decline in Title VI-B funds in 1979-80, program staff assisted parents in petitioning the Family Court in their county for tuition and transportation monies. Beginning that year and

---

[2] Title VI-B funding ranged from $24,803 in the last year (1979-80) to a high of $179,711 in 1977-78 for the entire BOCES Regional Program; part of these monies were used for the Classroom Program.

continuing through the present year, the Classroom Program has received per pupil tuition for each child enrolled as appropriate under Section 236 of the Family Court Act. Presently, the Program has five classrooms for the mildly and moderately impaired.[3] During this year, the Program is also receiving an HCEEP Outreach Grant from the U.S. Department of Education. Additionally, P.L. 89-313 monies at the rate of $733 per child for an enrollment of 105 children is being received for the 1981-82 school year.

Throughout the project's history, staff have been involved in program planning and development efforts. The present Program Supervisor and one of the speech/language pathologists participated in the conceptualization of the original program proposal. Once the program was funded, weekly staff meetings were held to discuss program improvements and refinements. During the funding for the demonstration project, staff took a more active role in developing the program's theoretical bases and description of services. Staff committees were formed to develop each aspect of the program; committees focused upon parent involvement, transdisciplinary approach, development of measurements and instruments, and defining key elements. Additionally, staff provided input and final approval on the Program's evaluation design which was developed in 1978. These evaluation procedures were defined through a contract with the Center for Resource Management, Inc., in Yorktown Heights, N.Y. Tasks and procedures outlined in the evaluation design were completed by the evaluation consultants in cooperation with program staff. During 1980-81, staff worked with these evaluation consultants to complete a submission for national validation; the Classroom Program received approval by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel in June, 1981.

TARGET GROUPS

The BOCES Classroom Program provides early intervention services for children 2½ to 5 years of age who exhibit one or more of the handicapping conditions defined for children in New York State. Classifications of handicapping conditions are determined according to the current Commissioner's Regulations for school-age children. The Classroom Program primarily serves preschool children with mild or moderate impairments.

Student placement in the Classroom Program is determined through a multi-step process which begins when a child is referred by the parent or professional for screening. During the screening procedure[4], an assessment is made of the child's level of functioning through a combination of parent interviews, behavioral observations and administration of formal and informal tests, including the Denver Developmental Screening Test. If the child is functioning significantly below the age-appropriate level in language, personal-social and/or motor skill areas, and is diagnosed according to state handicap classifications, he/she is considered eligible for program services. Final placement in Program classrooms is made on the basis of age and maturity of the child, the family/child interaction patterns, and the readiness of the child for classroom activities.

---

[3] The Classroom Program also includes one session for severely handicapped children and one session for seriously emotionally handicapped children and one transition class for five-year-olds; however, these sessions are not being presented for validation. Approximately 135 children are served annually by the Regional Program.

[4] Screening is conducted by the program's Central Screening Committee which includes a psychologist, social worker, speech pathologist, and classroom teacher.

During the 1978-80 school years, 125 children were enrolled in the Classroom Program. Their average age at the start of the program was 4.0 (range 3.0 to 4.8 years) and they represented the following types of handicaps: Severely Speech/Language Impaired, Emotionally Disturbed, Physically Handicapped, Specific Learning Disability, Hard of Hearing/Deaf, and Mentally Retarded.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Conceptual Framework

Key Aspects of Program. The salient features of the BOCES Classroom Program are its team involvement model and the interactive teaching process employed by classroom staff. For each feature, individual program elements are combined in a unique manner, forming an interrelated, comprehensive approach to both diagnostic-prescriptive services and classroom instruction.

With regard to the team involvement model, three elements characterize this service delivery system. First, parents are viewed as team members who provide critical input in the overall educational planning for their children. Together with other team members, i.e., a psychologist, social worker, speech and language pathologist, classroom teacher and teacher aide, parents are integrally involved in all project activities including assessment, planning, coordination and delivery of student services. Parents are specifically encouraged to participate as team members in the Classroom Program through the Parent Volunteer System.

The second element essential to this model is the classroom-focused approach to team activities. Unlike many other special education programs, the Program's transdisciplinary team not only provides consultative services, but also interacts directly with children in the instructional process. Both the team consultation and the delivery of services to children occur within the classroom setting in order to eliminate the stigma associated with pull-out approaches.

Finally, this model is characterized by the ongoing and consistent services provided by the transdisciplinary team. The same six individuals are involved in assessing the child's needs, developing her/his educational plan, delivering program services and planning or coordinating current and future placements. Consistency is further underscored by the role sharing which occurs among this team, so that each member addresses all of the educational goals prescribed for each program student. For instance, the speech pathologist focuses on a child's social-emotional growth and cognitive development, as well as her/his language production. Similarly, the psychologist utilizes language intervention techniques in combination with strategies designed for improving a child's self-concept. To accomplish such role sharing, team members train each other in appropriate techniques characteristic of their respective disciplines. Thus, the team involvement model is an integrated classroom-focused approach in which parents serve as active team members.

The second unique feature of this program, the interactive teaching process, involves the integrated use of three important teaching strategies -- diagnostic-prescriptive teaching, language intervention and positive reinforcement. While each of these educational techniques often exists in preschool handicapped programs, it is the frequent and simultaneous utilization of all three elements which characterize the BOCES Classroom Program approach. In project classrooms,

staff model appropriate language use, elicit children's language production, provide nonverbal, verbal and behavior-specific reinforcement, and attend to the individualized educational plans for each child on a continual basis. Specifically, Program standards indicate that staff are expected to spend over half of their classroom time engaged in the interactive teaching process.[5] As a result, students are exposed to a consistent form of instruction which focuses on the interrelationship of their cognitive development, language production and self-concept.

Theoretical Bases and Assumptions of Program. The key features of the Classroom Program -- the team involvement model and the interactive teaching process -- are based upon currently accepted theories in education or child development and empirical research data. Each of the interrelated elements which comprise these two key features has received substantial attention in the literature.

In the case of the team involvement model, research is available to support all three program elements. With respect to parent participation, such involvement has been well-documented as a vital aspect of successful early childhood programs (Peters, 1977). Research has also shown that a critical variable in achieving effective parent involvement is the inclusion of parents as part of the team responsible for planning educational programs for their children (Shearer & Shearer, 1972). Evidence regarding the second element, classroom-focused team activities, is drawn primarily from the theories of Bloom and Lahey (1978). These authors suggest that in order to make a child's experience with language frequent and relevant, speech pathologists must deliver language intervention services within the child's own environment, e.g., the classroom, and capitalize on his/her interests. The BOCES Classroom Program has extended this rationale to other team members as well, since the classroom-focused approach promotes both reinforcement of student learning and continuity of program services.

To support the provision of ongoing and consistent team services -- the third program element -- project staff have drawn evidence from Goehl and her colleagues (Goehl, Lee, Scheiblen & Specker, 1979) and the Task Force on Staff Development (1976). As these sources reveal, compartmentalization and fragmentation of services to children and their families are reduced through the use of a consistent team for planning and service delivery. Furthermore, they suggest that continual training and communication between team members enables these individuals to keep pace with advances made in the field and heighten the quality of services provided by the team. Thus, all three elements which comprise the team involvement model are grounded firmly in research and educational theory.

Similarly, the three elements which form the Program's interactive teaching process are supported substantially in the educational literature. With respect to the diagnostic-prescriptive teaching utilized in project classrooms, this methodology is drawn primarily from the theories of Gesell and his colleagues (Gesell, Halverson, Thompson, Ilg, Costner, Ames & Amatruda, 1940) and Piaget (1952). They indicate that children proceed through distinct stages of development where learning patterns are qualitatively different at each stage. Moreover, these theorists contend

---

[5] A thorough implementation study conducted in all four classrooms during the 1979-80 school year indicated that staff were engaged in behaviors congruent with the Interactive Teaching Process 61% of the time. Other investigators have found implementation rates for teaching roles and behaviors to be as low as 16%.

that children's movement through developmental stages is sequential and invariant, although the rate of movement for any particular child may vary considerably. Thus, the specific developmental level and corresponding curricula content for each child must be determined through a diagnostic-prescriptive process. In this way, sequenced skills can be specified for each child's individual level of functioning.

The language intervention and positive reinforcement strategies used by Program staff within the interactive teaching process are derived from the empirical research data of Bloom and Lahey (1978) and Brophy (1972), respectively. Bloom and Lahey have concluded that effective language intervention involves modifying the child's environment so that his/her experience with language is frequent and relevant. These authors suggest the use of strategies such as listening to children, accepting and expanding verbal interactions and modeling appropriate language use during the child's daily activities. In the case of reinforcement, Brophy has found that rewards and other positive reinforcing events are important motivators for learning among preschool children. Ongoing support to any appropriate behavior or learning exhibited by children can be provided through nonverbal, verbal and behavior-specific reinforcement techniques. This researcher further contends that the establishment of a positive milieu which allows for discovery and an acceptance of children's mistakes can also serve as an important motivator for learning. Thus, the elements of the interactive teaching process employed by Classroom Program staff are supported by educational research and child development theory.

Scope

The Classroom Program of the Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children operates under the auspices of the Special Education Department of the Putnam/Northern Westchester BOCES. As a component of a comprehensive regional program for handicapped children, birth to five, the Classroom Program is open to eligible children from a wide geographic area. To serve this population, the Program has three school-based sites. Three of the classrooms are housed in the French Hill School in Yorktown Heights, one in the Lakeview Elementary School in Mahopac, and one in the F. G. Lindsay Elementary School in Montrose, New York. All of these classrooms are operated by BOCES in cooperation with their host district. Participating children are bussed to the site closest to their homes with transportation services being provided by their local school district.

Articulation

The Classroom Program is administered by a Supervisor of Special Education who reports to the Director of Special Education for the Putnam/Northern Westchester BOCES. This Supervisor is responsible for the entire Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children and also acts as the Project Director for the HCEEP Outreach Project. The Supervisor oversees the total program including staff hiring, budget development, program evaluation and monitoring, staff supervision and training, program dissemination, and coordination with other BOCES and state and federal Departments of Education. In addition, there is a Program Coordinator who is responsible for managing services to children and families. The Coordinator's duties include identification and screening activities, team assessments, IEP development, parent involvement, and liaison work with school districts and counties. The Coordinator visits all sites and classrooms regularly to monitor direct services. Any problems and concerns that develop are reported to the Supervisor by either the Coordinator or other appropriate staff members.

Staff selection for the Classroom Program occurs upon agreement by the Coordinator, Supervisor and Director or Assistant Director of Special Education. All professional staff must be fully certified by the New York State Education Department for the position for which they are hired. Staff training occurs on an ongoing basis through peer exchange, staff meetings, and direct modeling by the Coordinator or Supervisor. Initial orientation and staff training in the parent/team involvement model is held in September for new and continuing staff. Periodic training in the interactive teaching process is provided through direct classroom observation and feedback by both the Coordinator and Supervisor. Other staff training is based upon staff needs and is held throughout the school year.

Classroom Activities

Within each Program classroom, both a morning and afternoon session are offered with approximately ten children in each session. Children spend 2½ hours per day, five days per week, over a ten-month period in classrooms staffed by a full-time teacher-teacher aide team with support from parent volunteers. The speech and language pathologist, psychologist and social worker who also work within this setting are available on a part-time basis.

The structured, routine schedule followed in Program classrooms is carefully planned and allows for large and small group activities, as well as individual time. The daily routine is similar in most classrooms, although the specific order of the activities may vary somewhat; a typical schedule is outlined below:

Arrival/Greeting:	A socialization period where children enter the classroom and engage in creative, free play experiences.
Opening Exercises:	A large group session where children share information and participate in lessons such as recognizing their own or classmates' names or naming months, seasons or holidays.
Individual/Small Group Activities:	Teacher works with children individually, focusing on IEP objectives; support staff works with small groups on structured art or gross motor activities.
Clean-up/Self-help:	Children help to put away toys and materials as well as taking care of washing and toileting (often occurs throughout the session).
Circle Time:	A structured activity in one of the skill areas where children are encouraged to take part at their own level of development; this time often includes a story or music, including songs and finger play.
Outdoor Play:	An opportunity for gross motor activities such as playing ball, climbing, and running.

Snack Time:	Focus is placed on social amenities and verbal communication.
Departure/Staff Sharing:	After children leave, staff engage in record-keeping, planning, and case conferences.

Through this structured routine, the Classroom Program provides a series of intensive learning experiences for participating students with careful attention paid to the instructional aspects of each activity in the daily schedule.

OBJECTIVES

One student objective with four parts is being presented for validation. Specifically, this objective is:

> After one year of program participation, students enrolled in the Classroom Program will demonstrate improved academic functioning in the following skill areas:
>
> a) Verbal Skills
> b) Perceptual Performance Skills
> c) Motor Skills
> d) General Cognitive Skills
>
> Growth in these skill areas will be evidenced by statistically significant pre- to posttest gains ($p < .05$) as compared to the norm group on the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities.

EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS

Sample

All students who attended the Classroom Program during the 1978-80 school years were considered for the final sample in this assessment of program effectiveness; the ultimate selection, however, was based on the availability of both pre- and posttest scores. A total of 102 different students met this testing criterion -- 54 who participated in the Program in 1978-79 and 48 who attended the Program in 1979-80. The final sample represented 82% of the entire Classroom Program enrollment for both years. Of the students not included in the final sample, several were untestable due to the severity of their handicap, while others had moved prior to the time of the posttest. There is no evidence to suggest that the students who left the program prior to the posttest differed in any significant way from the final sample of students.

Assessment Techniques

The McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities (MSCA), a widely known, standardized test, was the instrument used to assess student gains. The specific MCSA scales[6] utilized were the Verbal, Perceptual-Performance, General Cognitive, and Motor Scales, since they corresponded most directly to student goals.

[6] The McCarthy also provides Quantitative and Memory Scales.

The MSCA was administered on a pre- and posttest basis in October and May for both the 1978-79 and the 1979-80 school years. These dates corresponded with those of the standardization procedures.[7] The test was given to students by four graduate students in psychology who had previous experience in administering the MSCA; these individuals conducted both pre- and posttesting. The testers were trained and supervised in administering this test by a psychology professor prior to testing the Program students. In each instance the administration and scoring were in strict accordance with the publishers' instructions. Furthermore, the Supervisor of the Regional Program observed the testers periodically. After the observations, the Supervisor met with the testers to discuss their performance relative to rapport with children, the testing approach, accuracy of procedures and accuracy of scoring. These procedures thus insured the uniformity and accuracy of the student assessment process.

Reliability and Validity

The MSCA has one of the highest reliabilities of any early childhood measure; stability coefficients for the scales range from .77 to .91, while split-half coefficients range from .79 to .93. In addition, the test has demonstrated high criterion-related validity; the correlation coefficient between the General Cognitive Scale of the McCarthy and the Stanford-Binet is .81. The McCarthy is also highly correlated with the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (r=.71). Although the MSCA was standardized on a "normal" population, the manual specifies the applications of this instrument for exceptional children.

Evaluation Design

The ethical and legal considerations involved in selecting a control group for the Classroom Program population resulted in the choice of a quasi-experimental design -- norm-referenced evaluation -- where normative data served as the comparison by which to assess gains made by project students. In this design the pretest performance of each child in the treatment group was determined with respect to the appropriate age-norm group using the MSCA Scale Indexes -- normalized standard scores. Those children in the norm group who obtained the same test scores as the Classroom Program students thus served as a surrogate control group. It was assumed that, in the absence of the program, project students would maintain their standing with respect to this norm group from pre- to posttest. That is, at the time of the posttest Classroom Program students would have the same normalized standard score in terms of the norm group as they had at pretest time and thus, their standard score gain would be zero.[8] If the program made an impact, however, the pre- to posttest gain would be significantly greater than zero.

Analysis

Data were analyzed by comparing the mean pretest scores of Classroom Program students to their mean posttest scores for each of the four McCarthy Scales judged appropriate for measuring the impact of the program. A correlated t-test was used to test

---

[7] Age norms are available at half-year intervals between the ages of 2½ and 5½.

[8] A zero gain in normalized standard score units does not mean that project students learned nothing between pretest and posttest. Rather, the zero gain means that the amount of learning was precisely what would have been predicted under normal maturational growth.

statistical significance ($p < .05$, one-tailed probability). Furthermore, educational significance was established by comparing the size of the pre- to posttest gains to the standard deviation of the norm group.

Program Results

Statistical and Educational Significance. Results of the data analysis are presented in Table 1 for the 102 students who attended the Classroom Program during the 1978-80 school years.[9] As this table indicates, growth in relation to national norms was statistically significant for participating students.

TABLE 1

PRE/POSTTEST COMPARISONS ON THE McCARTHY SCALES FOR CHILDREN PARTICIPATING IN THE CLASSROOM PROGRAM IN 1978-80 (N=102)[a]

MSCA Scale	Scale Index Pretest Mean	Scale Index Pretest SD	Scale Index Posttest Mean	Scale Index Posttest SD	Scale Index Gains	Gain in SD Units	t[b]
Verbal	45.64	9.51	50.95	9.88	5.31	.53	6.7*
Perceptual-Performance	45.63	10.92	53.25	10.12	7.62	.76	9.5*
Motor	43.80	11.87	49.70	12.24	5.90	.59	3.3*
General Cognitive	91.31	17.17	101.38	15.87	10.07	.63	8.6*

[a] Pretest scores for two children were unavailable for the Motor Scale, thus N=100 for this scale.

[b] Degrees of freedom = 101 for all scales except Motor Scale; for this scale, the degrees of freedom = 99.

* $P < .001$

That is, the posttest scores for the children in the Classroom Program were significantly higher than their pretest scores, attesting to the program's effectiveness in improving students' verbal, perceptual-performance, motor, and general cognitive skills. The word "significant" is used here to designate both statistical significance at the .001 level and practical educational significance; the scale index gains were greater than one-half of a standard deviation, with an average of .63 standard deviations in relation to the national norms. A gain of one-third of a standard deviation was established as a criterion for determining educational significance (SD for Verbal, Perceptual-Performance and Motor Scales: 10; SD for General Cognitive: 16); that the size of the effect for Classroom Program students exceeded this figure attests to the meaningful nature of this program as an educational service for the preschool handicapped population.

[9] The average length of time these students were in the program was 9.3 months. (SD: .6; range: 7 months-10 months)

Cause and Effect. To determine if the Classroom Program results could be attributed to the program alone, several possible competing factors were examined: maturation, the history effect, the testing effect, statistical regression, and attrition. With respect to maturation, the norm-referenced design provided a control for this factor since the expected growth of students without the program was accounted for in the comparisons with the norm group. In terms of the history effect, a review of student records indicated that Classroom Program children did not receive additional intervention services (e.g., physical therapy, speech or language therapy) during the time of treatment which could account for their gains. Moreover, during the treatment period, there were no major change-producing events, such as new laws for the handicapped or variations in institutional schedules, which could explain these differences. Regarding the third factor, a general estimate for determining the size of a testing effect on posttest results is one-tenth the standard deviation; student gains were significant even when this effect was taken into account. The fourth factor, statistical regression, was minimized in that program students were not selected on the basis of their pretest scores. Finally, attrition was eliminated as a competing factor since it was determined by data analysis that students who dropped out of the program prior to the time of the posttest did not differ significantly from those who remained in the program on either educational variables or pretest scores.

Secondary Evidence. To add further support to the significance of project findings, the data were examined to determine if gains were evident for all types of children and consistent across program sites. Regarding the first issue, there were two concerns: a) are boys more likely to benefit from the preschool program than girls, or vice versa; and b) are children with certain types of handicaps more likely to benefit than children with other handicaps. Results indicated that all gains were consistent across levels of these factors; that is, the Program worked equally well for boys and girls and for all types of handicaps served. With respect to the second area, data were analyzed separately for the four program sites. These individual analyses indeed revealed that findings were consistently positive. Particularly noteworthy were the gains on the General Cognitive Scale -- all were greater than one-third of a standard deviation.

The program's educational significance and the successful growth and development of individual special needs children placed in the Program are also illustrated by the following case study:

> Louis, a severely speech and language impaired child, entered the Classroom Program in September, 1979, at three years, six months of age. At the time of screening, he had totally unintelligible speech and a severe hearing loss due to a history of otitis media -- fluid buildup in the middle ear. The screening report described his specific weakness as: "short attention span, distractible, articulation severely impaired, receptive language better than expressive." When Louis entered the classroom setting, he also manifested some mild social problems as a result of his handicap. His attention span during group time never exceeded two minutes, and he would not participate in group activities spontaneously.
>
> Seven months after Louis entered the program, the transdisciplinary team assessment indicated marked improvement. The speech pathologist described his speech as "reduced intelligibility with context unknown," a distinct change from his totally unintelligible speech at the beginning of the year. Overall, team members said Louis "enjoys learning new activities and has an excellent attention span." Additionally, his mother stated her pleasure with Louis' speech and language abilities, as he had not been able to talk at all until he was almost four years old.

Team records indicate that, during Louis' second year in the Classroom Program, he maintained his capabilities over the summer and continued to show improvement in his primary handicapping area. He was subsequently placed in a regular nursery school program where he was able to function with minimal speech services.

Finally, student placement data provided additional evidence of program effectiveness. An examination of project records revealed that 65% of the Classroom Program graduates were placed in regular or transition classes upon leaving this preschool program. Only 35% of these students were assigned to special education classes, indicating that the Program placed the majority of its participants in the educational mainstream.

Adoption Information

In addition to the replication activities which have taken place within the Classroom Program itself, i.e., an expansion from two to ten sessions in the last six years, project staff have provided a variety of different outreach services to potential adopters over the past several years. Specifically, staff have conducted general awareness activities, sponsored on-site visitations, and provided training on the Parent Volunteer System and the Transdisciplinary Team Model. During 1979-80, a replication site was established in South Orangetown, New York, with a special focus on the team involvement model. Student impact data collected from this site indicated that target children made gains consistent with the BOCES Classroom Program; that is, statistically significant differences were found from pre- to posttest on all McCarthy Scales. Two additional replication sites in Warwick and Woodstock, New York were established during the 1980-81 school year. Implementation data is being collected from these sites during the current program year.

Further information about the adoption procedures for the Classroom Program are provided in the items below:

1. Will the program be available for observation during the next school year? YES .

2. Will personnel be available (if funded externally) for training purposes during the school year? YES During the summer? YES

3. How many days of initial training are required? 6 DAYS* (If more than one trainer is needed, indicate how many. _____
   *(for implementation of all program components)

4. How many days of follow-up training are required? 1 DAY PER SITE

5. Is "on-site" monitoring of program implementation desirable? YES If yes, how many days? 4-5 DAYS PER SITE, INCLUDING DATA TABULATION AND ANALYSIS.

6. What is the recommended size for the training group? 20 PERSONS

7. Is it necessary for training to take place in the Demonstration district? NO

8. What types of activities take place during training (e.g., making lesson plans)?

   The training process for the BOCES Classroom Program consists of a ½-day orientation conference and 4 individual workshops on the key elements of the Program. Training activities include lectures, demonstrations/modeling, "hands-on" activities (such as TD assessments), role playing, and audio-visual presentations.

9. List the materials to be used during training which will be available from the Demonstration district at cost (e.g., curriculum guides, tests).

   - The Curriculum Model for a Regional Demonstration Program for Preschool Handicapped Children
   - Classroom-Directed Home Training Activities
   - The Transdisciplinary Training, Assessment and Consultation Model
   - The Parent Volunteer System: A Manual and an Activity Catalog for Teachers

10. List the materials which must be purchased or rented from a commercial source for program implementation (e.g., films, textbooks, achievement tests).

No commercial materials are required for program implementation; use of the McCarthy Scales are preferred for impact evaluation.

11. List the items of equipment which must be used for program implementation (if any).

No specific equipment is required; however, a suggested listing of classroom equipment and supplies is available from the Program.

12. Indicate any special facilities necessary for program implementation (e.g., one-way windows).

No special facilities are necessary; a typical early childhood classroom is appropriate for program implementation.

13. How many school districts (separate adoptions) could receive training and monitoring each year?

With a full-time trainer and dissemination funding for travel expenses, as many as twenty full-scale adoptions could be managed. If different adoption sites were combined during training, even more adoptions could be arranged.

REFERENCES

Bloom, L., & Lahey, M. Language development and language disorders. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Brophy, J. The role of rewards and reinforcement in early education programs: II. Fostering intrinsic motivation to learn. The Journal of School Psychology, 1971, 10, 243-251.

Gesell, A., Halverson, H.M., Thompson, H., Ilg, F.G., Costner, B.M., Ames, L.B., & Amatruda, C.S. The first five years of life: A guide to the study of the preschool child. New York: Harper & Row, 1940.

Goehl, J., Lee, M., Scheiblen, S., & Specker, H. Report of the task force on program implementation. Early intervention of developmental disabilities. Bloomington, Indiana: Developmental Training Center, Indiana University, 1979.

Peters, D.L. Early childhood education: An overview and evaluation. In H.S. Horn, Jr. & P.S. Robinson (Eds.), Psychological processes in early education. N.Y., N.Y.: Academic Press, 1977.

Piaget, J. The origins of intelligence in children. Translated by Margaret Cook. New York: International University Press, 1952.

Shearer, M.S. & Shearer, D.E. The Portage Project: A model for early childhood education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 36, 210-217.

Task Force on Staff Development of the UCPA. Staff development handbook: A resource for the transdisciplinary process. New York: United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 1976.

Revised May 1982

File # V-51
Reviewer # Composite

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Project Title: The Classroom Program of the Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children

School District: Putnam/Northern Westchester BOCES

The number of objectives to be reviewed is: 1

SED Unit conducting review: _____

A copy of this review will be submitted to the Applicant. Please make any comments understandable to the author of the Application. In anticipation of questions of clarification, it would be advisable to retain a copy of both the Application and this review. If you do not wish your name to appear on the copy which is returned to the Applicant, check here: _____. Please return the original to:

Dr. Richard L. Egelston
Coordinator of Validation
Room 860 EBA
New York State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234

Please complete the following:

1. Which objectives (if any) are nominated for validation? #1
2. For which target groups (if not all) does the nomination for Validation apply (e.g., grade levels)? preschool (age 2½-5) handicapped
3. Date of review: April 23 to May 8, 1982
4. Signature of reviewer (optional): Composite of 4 reviewers.
5. Comment to LEA: All relevant comments have been included. The comments seem extensive and overly critical, but they are relatively minor. This is one of the most thoroughly prepared Applications we have received to date.

Ratings for Preliminary Review

Diagnostic Evaluation

Please circle the number corresponding to your judgment. Indicate on the comment line the nature of the changes to be made in the Application when any rating of 1 or 2 is given. Use additional sheets if necessary. The first two pages and the last page provide ratings which pertain to the project as a whole. Each of the other categories in this form pertains to a single objective. Each objective nominated for validation should stand alone and not be dependent upon other objectives. Each objective is to be rated or discussed on items spread over two pages. If two or more objectives have been submitted, supplementary pages have been attached to this document. In reviewing the Application, you may treat each objective separately, or you may treat them collectively. If the latter technique is used, please write-in the numbers of the objectives so treated in the space provided at the right of the page. Refer to pages 15-18 of this document for a description of the rating scales.

Sections and Ratings					Comments
SUMMARY					
Clear	NA	1	2	(3)	Summary: A concise overview could be included.
Complete	NA	1	2	(3)	
Accurate	NA	1	2	(3)	
PROPOSAL NARRATIVE					
1. GOALS (not to be rated)					
2. CONTEXT					
a. Community description					
clear	NA	1	2	(3)	
complete	NA	1	2	(3)	
b. School description					
clear	NA	1	2	(3)	
complete	NA	1	(2)	3	2b. BOCES enrollment information, especially preschool, could be more completely described (e.g., ethnic compositions).
c. Program rationale					
clear	NA	1	2	(3)	
complete	NA	1	(2)	3	2c. Rationale for deciding how many to be screened, and how many to be treated should be included. Was there any rationale, other than consensus of administrators, for identification (e.g., behavioral criteria which could be related to the literature on handicapped children)?
d. Program history					
clear	NA	1	2	(3)	
complete	NA	1	2	(3)	

B-2 E-18

3. TARGET GROUP

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	(2)	3

4. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

a. Conceptual framework

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	2	(3)
appropriate	NA	1	2	(3)

b. Scope

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	2	(3)

c. Articulation

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	2	(3)

d. Staff activities

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	2	(3)

e. Target group activities

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	2	(3)

f. Key definitions

clear	NA	1	(2)	3
complete	NA	1	(2)	3

B-3 E-19

COMMENTS

3. See 4f below

See 6a on next page

4c. No mention is made of coordination with local Committees on the handicapped, SETRC, or Early Childhood Direction Centers.

4d,e Sections omitted, but most information is contained under "Classroom Activities." However, more information should be included for supporting professionals (e.g., speech and language pathologist, pychologist, and the social worker).

4f. Page E-5 "Target Groups" contains terms which should be defined or described (e.g., "mild or moderate impairments," and "significantly below" age-appropriate level).

5. OBJECTIVE(s) 1

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	(2)	3
appropriate	NA	1	(2)	3

6. EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS

a. Sample selection

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	(2)	3
appropriate	NA	1	(2)	3

b. Assessment techniques

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	(2)	3
appropriate	NA	1	(2)	3

c. Validity of assessments

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	2	(3)
appropriate	NA	1	2	(3)
convincing	NA	1	2	(3)

d. Reliability of assessments

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	2	(3)
appropriate	NA	1	2	(3)
convincing	NA	1	2	(3)

e. Evaluation design

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	2	(3)
appropriate	NA	1	2	(3)

f. Data presentation

clear	NA	1	2	(3)
complete	NA	1	2	(3)
convincing	NA	1	2	(3)

90

B-4 E-20

COMMENTS

5. Length of intervention should be indicated in objective as being from October to May, since these dates represent the end points for assessments.

6.a. Either the "Target Group" or "Sample Selection" should include a full description of screening procedures (e.g., all instruments and judgmental criteria). Inclusion of the number of students who were untestable and/or who left would be helpful.

6b. Indicate the metric used (e.g., raw scores, NCE's) here. October to May is 7 months, but norms are provided for 6 month separations. Might this be a factor? There are some editorial comments included!

6e. Rating is based upon assumption that both October and May norms were independently normalized.

6f. See "Program Results" section of Application.

g. Statistical comparisons
clear NA 1 2 (3)
complete NA 1 2 (3)
appropriate NA 1 2 (3)
convincing NA 1 2 (3)

h. Educational significance
clear NA 1 2 (3)
complete NA 1 2 (3)
appropriate NA 1 2 (3)
convincing NA 1 2 (3)

i. Cause and effect
clear NA 1 2 (3)
complete NA 1 2 (3)
convincing NA 1 2 (3)

j. Secondary evidence etc.
clear NA 1 2 (3)
complete NA 1 2 (3)
appropriate NA 1 2 (3)

7. ADOPTION INFORMATION

a. Planning Information
clear NA 1 2 (3)
complete NA 1 2 (3)

b. Cost Comparisons
clear (NA) 1 2 3
complete (NA) 1 2 3

COMMENTS

6g, h. Contained in "Program Results."

7b. The version of the guidelines used by the Applicant did not require this information. The current version does.

JUDGEMENTS BY REVIEWER

a. Is evidence sufficiently convincing for the objective to be nominated for validation? (Circle one) (Yes) No
b. Is the objective important enough to be replicated in other districts if validated? (Circle one) (Yes) No
c. Would you support this objective for National Validation based on the evidence provided? (Circle one) (Yes) No
d. Is the program in compliance with current Federal and state regulations? (Circle one) (Yes) No

Revised May 1982

File # V-51

VALIDATION TEAM REPORT

for

Project Title The Classroom Program of the Regional Program for Preschool Handicapped Children

School District Putnam/Northern Westchester Board of Cooperative Educational Services

Signature of Chairperson Dr. Reuben R. Rusch

Address: Ed. Bldg. 233, SUNYA, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, N.Y. 12222

Telephone No. (518) 457-8240

Other Members Of Team (Print Names) William T. Pardy, John E. Henley, Mary D. Horan

Dates of Visit June 10-11, 1982

Within the attached Application for Validation 1 objectives were nominated for validation by the preliminary reviewers.

How many objectives (if any) are recommended for validation by the Validation Team? 1. If some are recommended, but not all, which ones are recommended (identify by number)? _____.

Were the recommendations for Validation by the Team unanimous? Yes. If not, a minority report should be included.

Which sections, if any, of the Application for Validation have been rewritten as a result of the site visit? None.

Please return one copy of this review form to Coordinator of Validation, Room 860 EBA, New York State Education Department, Albany, New York 12234. Copies of this report will be sent to the project director or coordinator, and to appropriate Bureaus within the New York State Education Department. Each Team member will also be sent a copy.

Summary Rating for the Validation Team

Please circle the letters and numbers which correspond to the collective judgment of the Validation Team for each section and subsection. When ratings of 1 are given, submit an addendum explaining evidence. Please note that if more than one objective is being examined, separate rating forms for each objective may be attached. Any explanations should be attached on separate pages. The descriptions of the Ratings for the codes may be found on pp. 24-26 of this manual.

Section	Verification Procedures	Degree of Convincing
Summary	**********	**********
1. Goals	**********	**********
2. Context	**********	**********
a. Community Description	A (B) (C) D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 (4) (5) NA
b. District Description	(A) B (C) D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
c. Program Rationale	(A) B (C) D E (F) G H I NA	1 2 3 (4) 5 NA
d. Program History	(A) B (C) D E (F) G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
3. Target Group	A B C D E F G H I NA See Attached	1 2 3 4 5 NA
4. Project Description	**********	**********
a. Conceptual Framework	(A) (B) (C) D (E) (F) G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
b. Scope	(A) (B) (C) D (E) F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
c. Articulation	(A) (B) (C) D (E) (F) G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
d. Staff Activities	(A) (B) (C) D (E) (F) G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
e. Target Group Activities	(A) (B) (C) D (E) F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
f. Key Definitions	A B C D E F G H I (NA)	1 2 3 4 5 (NA)
5. Objective(s) # 1	A (B) (C) D (E) (F) G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
6. Evidence	**********	**********
a. Sample Selection	(A) B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
b. Assessment Techniques	(A) B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
c. Validity	(A) B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
d. Reliability	(A) B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
e. Evaluation Design	(A) B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
f. Data Presentation	(A) B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
g. Statistical Comparisons	(A) B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
h. Educational Significance	(A) B C D E F G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
i. Cause and Effect	A (B) C D E (F) G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
j. Secondary Evidence	A (B) C D E (F) G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA
7. Adoption Information	(A) (B) (C) D E (F) G H I NA	1 2 3 4 (5) NA

Does the Validation Team Recommend the objective(s) rated above for Validation (circle one)? (Yes) No

C-2 E-23

File # V-51

91

92

Narrative

1. Goals
2. Context

3. Target Group

From the Proposal for Validation, one gets the impression that all kinds of handicapped children are included. In reality, those physically handicapped are excluded, as are some others who can be referred elsewhere.

4. Program Description

a. Conceptual Framework: The key aspects of the program -- the team involvement model and the interactive teaching process -- are clearly observable and verifiable. Both of these components also appear well developed and apparent in a variety of key activities (i.e., screening, conferencing, teaching-learning process in the classroom).

c. Articulation: The administrative and supervisory structure, depicted in this section of the "Application for Validation" is accurate and represents the working model. Both professions, by all criteria, appear to actualize their roles based on a clear conceptualization of project objectives coupled with the ability to translate those objectives into effective activities.

5. Objectives

Classrooms were visited, interviews were conducted with parents and program staff, student files were read, and test data and analyses were inspected. Evidence was complete and indicated a thorough verification of claims presented in the application.

6. Evidence

All information, for this section, included in the proposals, was verified, including class lists and individual scores. Considerable information not found in the Application for Validation was also available including analyses of subgroups, and follow-up studies.

7. Adoption Information

While it evidently was not required as part of the original Application for Validation, the applicant has provided a Comparison of Costs as required in the present guidelines. This analysis should be included when information about the program is disseminated. It is also suggested that under Section D-2 Adoption Information-Comparison of Cost, a statement be added: a district interested in replication might have to include one or more of the following items in estimating the cost of the program.

1. Transportation
2. Facilities
3. Consultant and/or other professional services